

The
Authority of General
Councils.

VOL - 15



Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library

Govt. of West Bengal



THE
AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS
EXAMINED,
AND ROMAN FORGERIES THEREIN
DETECTED

AN HISTORICAL EXAMINATION
OF THE
AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS,
SHOWING

THE FALSE DEALING THAT HATH BEEN USED IN THE PUBLISHING OF THEM; AND THE DIFFERENCE AMONGST THE PAPISTS THEMSELVES ABOUT THEIR NUMBER.

THE PREFACE.

THE chief controversies between the Church of England and the Church of Rome have of late been managed to the best advantage on both sides. The more judicious seem to be satisfied, and others to be tired out with a close and eager debate of above two years' continuance; all seem to be settled now, and fixed in their principles, and every one sees, or thinks he sees, on which side the truth lies. I am confident all has been said for Popery that can be said, though I am not so well assured that much more might not have been said against it, which has been spared out of a regard to our common Christianity, and to religion in general, besides the respect due to a great and gracious Prince of that communion. But our adversaries have not been wanting to their own cause in this opportunity, nor in the least favourable to ours. At first, they would seem to be satisfied, if they could be truly represented and rightly

THE PREFACE.

understood ; but those colours were soon wiped off, and something must be done to blacken us, when they could not appear so lovely as they desired. Laborious attempts, therefore, have been made against the chief points of the Reformation, against our office of the eucharist, against our Church-government and ordination, and all this by a person who has been so little convinced by these books, that while he had them by him he lived in our communion for many years, however now they come to operate upon him. But if they have no speedier effect upon others than they have had upon him, they seem to be designed for the conversion of the next age, and indeed they hitherto have had but little success upon this. But I leave him to God and to his own conscience, though the world may justly expect an account from him, to shew that anything has been ever said to give us a worse representation of Popery than such a practice may do. It is certain, nothing has been left unattempted which might blemish the Church of England in its doctrine, or in its discipline. And to give the work its last and heroic turn, and shame men into a sense of religion, and into a true notion of the Catholic Church, beasts have been made to dispute in the magnificence of verse above the ordinary capacities of men, and if this fails to work upon a sullen and obstinate age, nothing can ever do it. Herein the author follows the wisdom of the ancients, who were wont to instil their doctrines by fables and allusions ; but, as his manner is, he has mightily improved this way beyond whatever the ancients knew. For their beasts were wont to speak as you would imagine beasts to do, if they had the use of speech ; but his beasts are all heroes, and exceed most men that ever I met with. *Æsop* and *Phædrus* were content with beasts as they found them ; only they made them prate after a brutish kind of fashion. *Horace's* brutes too were as unheroical brutes as any of *Æsop's*, and *Virgil* himself could not advance his beasts one pitch above their nature. No, his monarch of the bees did not, that I can understand, make one heroic buzz. But our poet, to the confusion of mankind, has made brutes speak such rare things as no man ever spoke, nor perhaps can understand.

Yet after all that has been said in verse or in prose against us, or in behalf of the Church of Rome, I am not convinced but that she is the same Church of Rome still which she was an hundred years ago ; nay, she would not be thought otherwise ; that were as much as her infallibility is worth. There is

not the least concern of ours to discover the Church of Rome to be worse than she is now represented to be, but we should be glad if we were mistaken, and could find her so much altered for the better. It were inexcusable in us to dislike, or not to acknowledge anything of a Reformation, which was carried on here by degrees, and we pray God to prosper any beginnings of it in other countries. But if the Church of France must be put upon us for the whole Roman Catholic Church, and the sentiments of some particular men for the doctrines of that Church; if we must be persuaded that all the varieties and diversities of opinions in the Church of Rome have ever been infallibly the same, and that Italy will subscribe to what France shall dictate, or that even all or the greatest part of the clergy of France will agree to the Bishop of Meaux's softenings and refinings; these are strange things, and will not readily be admitted. France has indeed all the learning of the Roman communion confined in a manner within itself, and seems to set up for an empire of arts and religion as well as of arms, and that must needs pass for catholic doctrine that has so much learning and so many legions to defend it. The Jesuits have a known distinction between the Popery of France and the Popery of Rome, as F. Cotton confessed in the point of allegiance: and they are of late much concerned for the interest of the French Church, and for the Pope's infallibility even in matters of fact at the same time, so that if at any time by the power of France they can get a Pope of their society, by virtue of a very convenient doctrine, that the Pope may choose his own successor, they have at once an infallible and a perpetual Pope, and then the Jesuits' morals may be gospel, though the present Pope has termed them scandalous; but that may be scandalous at one time which is not so at another. (Suarez asserts, that the Pope may change the manner of election now in use, *apud Carleton Curs. Theologic. tom. poster. Disputat. 22. sect. 6.*)

It is certain that Popery is carried on in all its heights even in France itself, and the Gallican privileges betrayed by that very sort of men who would now be thought the chief defenders of them. The author of a book entitled, the Pernicious Consequences of the New Heresy of the Jesuits against the King and the State, published February 1, 1662, being an advocate of Parliament, complains that the opinion of the Pope's infallibility had got ground in France, and that there was great likelihood of its spreading daily, it being the general opinion of

the Jesuits, who are a vast body diffused throughout all parts of the world, and have the education of youth wherever they come. Duvall endeavoured to introduce this doctrine into the Sorbonne, but attempted it warily, saying, that neither the one nor the other side of the question is *de fide*. But though he was all his life in great favour at Rome, yet has he since been very ill treated by F. Raynaud, a Jesuit at Lyons, for his great caution and restraint in a matter of that importance. (P. 85, 86.) He shews that this doctrine by degrees gained ground, till the Jesuits growing daily more insolent, proceeded to that extravagant thesis of the College of Clermont, wherein they dared to maintain publicly in the midst of Paris itself, and in the face of the Parliament, that Jesus Christ has given to all Popes, whenever they shall speak *à cathedrâ*, the same infallibility himself had, as well in matters of fact as of right. Great care is taken to suppress all books which thwart this doctrine, and to publish and give credit to such as may infuse it. Baronius and his continuators are the authors for history chiefly in vogue, and these without coming near him in his excellencies, infinitely surpass him in his faults. He particularly observes Raynaldus to have been a man without the spirit of an ecclesiastic, without style, without judgment, without sincerity, without credit, yet he had the boldness to dedicate his eighteenth tome to the French clergy, and presented it to the Assembly of the Clergy, 1660; and though this doctrine of the authority of Councils is everywhere styled schismatical and heretical, the Pragmatic Sanction vilified, the Council of Basil outraged, and all the Popes who possessed the see in Avignon during the schism pronounced anti-popes, who are the only Popes that France has acknowledged, though the most indefensible pretences of the Church of Rome are everywhere justified, yet all the disfavour or discouragement that book met with was, that Raynaldus did not receive a letter of thanks from the French clergy, as he expected, but no sentence being passed upon it, this silence, as my author observes, will be one day taken for a tacit approbation, and the abettors of the Court of Rome believe with great reason that they have however gained a main point, since there has been nothing positively done against such a work presented to the whole clergy, besides the advantage gained by having such books received and read without prohibition, that may instill those principles (p. 94, &c.), whereas the episcopal decrees of the bishops of France have been treated by the bishops of Rome to that degree of in-

dignity as to be ranged among the condemned books, without vouchsafing either to clear it with the bishops before censure, or to render them any account of what they thought amiss afterwards. (p. 71.)

After all the hideous outcries against Richerius, when he requested of a certain bishop, one of Cardinal Perron's intimate friends, that he might have a fair hearing, and liberty allowed him to offer what he had to say in defence of his book *de Ecclesiastica Potestate*, the bishop freely told him, that he had made himself so many enemies, not by writing errors, but too plain and unpleasing truths, that though there was nothing could be disproved in his book, yet the churchmen had much rather have their sole dependence on the Pope, than the perpetual trouble and dissatisfaction of appearing before the secular judges. (Richer. *Pref. ad. Conc. Gen.*) The Pope promised the Duke of Esperron a cardinalship for his son, if he would deliver him Richerius into the Inquisition; whereupon he was thrust into prison: but the whole University of Paris interceded for him to the Parliament, and upon a full hearing he was released: but the Pope recompensed the Duke's good will with the promised reward to his son. And when Richelieu requested a red hat of Urban VIII. for his brother, Richerius's retractation was the price must be paid for it. The apostolic notary comes to Paris, and is entertained by Father Joseph, a Capuchin, who having left his convent then lived in the city. This Father Joseph was Richelieu's confessor, and was employed by him to prepare all business first, and then to bring it to him. *Butillerius Pater, et Josephus Capucinus negotia cruda accipiunt, cocta ad Cardinalem deferunt.* (Grot. Lett. 375. Par. 1.) In Easter week, an acquaintance of Father Joseph's, one of the Sorbonne, and a great friend, as he pretended, to Richerius, is sent to the good man to invite him in Father Joseph's name to dinner, that so he might give his opinion in a point of controversy. Richerius excused it, saying he never frequented feasts, but he would wait upon him after dinner; but being pressed to come, not to be uncivil, he complied. As soon as dinner was done, a question was designedly moved, concerning the Pope's authority, of which when Richerius discoursed, modestly, as his manner was, Father Joseph tells him, now, says he, you must either retract your book, which you formerly writ, *de Ecclesiastica et Politicu Potestate*, or die for it. At that certain ruffians rushed forth armed from behind the hangings, and threatened to murder him. In this dreadful surprise, the poor old man subscribed a retractation ready pre-

pared and drawn up for him, and immediately was carried home; where, when he considered what he had done, he wrote this account of the business to his friend Morisotus, lamenting extremely his own timorousness and fainting under this calamity, so much more grievous than death to him; he had scarce sealed his letter, but flinging himself upon his bed, he died. (Claudii Barthol. Morisoti Epist. ad Carelum in fin. Vindic. Doctr. &c. Rich. lib. 4. p. 100.) How little better Launoy fared, is sufficiently known from an account of his life, lately printed at London.

Whilst these are the proceedings against the advocates for the Gallican Church, its adversaries are encouraged, and their works in high esteem. The Abridgment of the Councils by Coriolanus was printed at Paris, and revised by a Doctor of the Faculty, though all the contrary maxims to the doctrine of the Gallican Church, are set at the beginning of the book as so many Catholic doctrines. And the Councils are published by men devoted to the Pope: for the Jesuits have ever had the government of the royal press; and in printing the Councils have left in the life of Boniface VIII., these outrageous words, as the advocate justly terms them, against all France, *Philippum Pulchrum Gallia Regem juste excommunicavit*, and this printed at the King's house, at his own charges, (New Heresy, p. 100.) Nor is there the least intimation given that that Pope exceeded his authority, when he threatened to depose him. (Vit. Bonif. Octavi, tom. 28. p. 676.) And though Cossartius takes notice that Binius was mistaken in saying, Philip was justly excommunicated, whereas he was not indeed at all excommunicated, yet is not one word said, but that he might deserve to be excommunicated, or any thing to the contrary, but that the Pope did very well in threatening him with deposition. (Conc. Labbé, tom. 2. part 2. p. 1389.)

The judicious advocate above-mentioned, foresaw what was to be expected from this last edition of the Councils, which was in hand, for Labbé had caused a draught of the work to be printed, and I am apt to think, that through this author's complaint the Council of Basil had more right done it than otherwise it would have had. But the treatises prefixed in the apparatus are such as quite overthrow the Gallican privileges, and the doctrines peculiar to that Church. For Cardinal Jacobatius, *de Conciliis*, sets himself purposely to prove the superiority of the Pope to a Council, and answers all objections against it (lib. 10 p. 519. in Appar. Concil.

Labbé), and in plain terms denies the authority of the decrees of Constance; and making use of those known evasions, that these decrees were to take place only in the times of schism between two contending Popes, or in case of heresy, or that it was no general constitution, but limited to the present exigency of affairs; in short, he denies that any constitution of a Council can bind the Pope, because he has no superior but God; and so in all points he palpably contradicts the doctrine of the French Church, (p. 536.) Paulus Fabulottus, *de Potestate Papæ supra Concilium*, proves his tenets by all manner of arguments from Scripture, from reason, from history, from Fathers and from Councils; and in his fifth chapter where he shews the Pope's superiority from Councils, he shews particularly that the French ought not to except against the authority of the last Council of the Lateran, because they acknowledge its authority, in enjoying the privileges granted them in the bull of Leo X., which confirmed it; and it is unreasonable, says he, that they should allow it when it makes for their advantage, and reject it in other matters, (Fabulott. ib. p. 69, 70.) He pretends to shew that Martin V. did by his bull retract the decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions of Constance, made, says he, in schism, by appointing the question to be put to all suspected of heresy, *An credant Romanum Pontificem in Dei Ecclesia supremam habere Potestatem?* "Whether they believe that the Pope has supreme power in the Church of God?" And so turns the Council of Constance upon the French. (ib.) In a word, he concludes, that whoever persists obstinately in the contrary opinion, against so many Councils (for he produces no fewer than six, whereof that of Constance is the second), must needs be an heretic. He particularly answers the objections brought from the Council of Constance in the usual manner; as for the Council of Basil, he says, all Catholics confess it was not a lawful Council, when it defineth Councils to be above the Pope. At last he concludes with admiration, that any one should, to the destruction of his soul, be so perverse as to call in question so certain a truth, established on so strong arguments and so great authorities. Caranza maintains the Pope's infallibility, and says, it was never doubted of till the Councils of Constance and Basil. (Controver. 3. p. 112. in Appar. Labbei.) He spends his fourth controversy in shewing, against these two Councils, that Popes are against General Councils. Petrus de Monte in his *Monarchia*, runs as high as any of the rest, and, to make a Pope a complete monarch,

exempts the clergy from the obedience, and their possessions from the dominions of temporal princes, (in *Apparat.* p. 155.) But Jäcobatius, if it be possible, goes beyond this. For he maintains the deposing power, and affirms, that the Pope alone may depose emperors and kings, and whomsoever he pleases, and particularly the King of France, and this without the advice and concurrence of his cardinals; he makes no doubt of his deposing power, the only question is, whether he can do it alone without his cardinals, and he determines in the affirmative, (*ibid.* p. 329.) so little regard is to be had to that which is esteemed the doctrine of the French Church, and which some would have us think is the Roman Catholic doctrine; and the doctrine against the Pope's infallibility, the *Sententia Parisiensium*, as it is called in contempt, is every where decried, even in Paris itself.

The Jesuits at Cologne laid down this rule, *In Censura Coloniensi*, fol. 132. If any man examine the doctrine of the Pope by the rule of God's word, and seeing that it is different, chance to contradict it, let him be rooted out with fire and sword. (Walsh, *Irish Remonstr. Treat.* 4. p. 61.) And both the clergy and people of the Roman communion in Ireland generally hold the Pope's infallibility, being influenced by the Jesuits, as they are in most places. Insomuch that in 1666 they refused to sign the three last of the six propositions which the Sorbonne in 1663 had presented to the Most Christian King, and to apply them as they did the first three, to his Majesty of Great Britain and his subjects, though they contain nothing but an assertion of the King's prerogatives, and a denial of the Pope's infallibility. (*Irish Remon. Treat.* 3. p. 23. and *Treat.* 4. p. 58.) This we are told by one who is an advocate for Popish loyalty, and it is confessed by another, who made it the business of his life to write against the deposing doctrine, that this is the doctrine most generally received among those of that communion. (*Neque quenquam movere debet, ut alias observavi, (in Apol. num. 4. 49. uti citatur in margine,) quod opinio hæc, quæ Summo Pontifici hanc potestatem tribuit, communior sit quam opposita, pluresque Doctores eam sequantur, &c.* Widrington, *Discuss. Discussionis Pref.*) So little security have we that Popery is the same thing in France that it is at Rome and in other Popish countries, or that the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition is good Popery, even in Paris itself. But that which is the doctrine generally taught, we are often told by the Guide, is equivalent to the definitions of a General Council, inasmuch as

no Council can be known to be general, nor consequently to teach true doctrine, but by the reception it meets with from the Church, and so the misrepresenters will be found to be those that soften and palliate Popery, contrary to the sense of the most of that communion.

I am sure Cardinal Poole and his Synod at Lambeth, 1556, were for Popery as it is at Rome; they did not content themselves to fetch it from France. For they receive the *Bulla Cœne*, equalling its authority even to the decrees of General Councils and Apostolical traditions; and they profess to own the full extent of power attributed to the Pope by the Council of Florence, (Decret. 2.) and they quote it in the usual form, "Quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in Sacris Canonibus continetur;" not, "Quemadmodum et," &c. as we are now taught to read it according to the true translation, (vid. Walsh's Lett. to the Bishop of Lincoln, p. 274.) if such a nicety will make any material difference; and this was done by Cardinal Poole, by virtue of his legantine power in a provincial Synod.

However, the constant appeal now is from the sentiments of private men and particular synods, to the definitions of General Councils, which are appealed to with as much confidence, as if not one of them had ever been suspected or called in question, but were all of undoubted authority; whereas there is indeed nothing more suspected than the credit of most of them, and the chief tenets of Popery will be found to have but little authority from the General Councils: the worship of images will stand in great need of the second Council of Nice; and transubstantiation, auricular confession, &c. will want support from the fourth of the Lateran: and, in short, it will be almost as difficult to defend the Councils brought to authorise them, as to defend the doctrines themselves. I think I have made it evident that this argument from the authority of Councils will be as unsuccessful as all other arguments have hitherto proved: for it is a vain thing to attempt by any means the defence of a cause which will not be defended.

But in my opinion the famous Mr. Schelstrate has gone the farthest towards the finding out an expedient which may be of equal force in all controversies. For in the year 1685 he put out a book intituled, *Dissertatio Apologetica de Disciplina Arcani*, against Ernestus Tentzelius, a Lutheran divine, in defence of his Commentaries upon the second canon of the Council of Antioch. In this book he shews, that the Church

concealed her doctrines a long time, and that the stream of tradition, like some rivers, ran for a great way under ground, till at last it broke out and discovered itself in this age or that Council. If you inquire why we read nothing of transubstantiation in ancient authors? The answer is very easy and ready; *Disciplina Arcani*: (p. 150, 151.) Why the Fathers did not assert the worship of images? *Disciplina Arcani*: (p. 124.) Why the doctrine of the Trinity was not clearly taught before the Council of Nice? *Disciplina Arcani*: (p. 10—17.) Why we have no accounts of the seven sacraments before the seventh century? *Disciplina Arcani*: (p. 104—106.) Why the writings of St. Denis the Areopagite lay so long concealed? *Disciplina Arcani*: (p. 120.) And so for any novelty else *Disciplina Arcani* still returns upon you, and it is so great a charm, that some would be almost afraid of it, for it has a strange faculty of making every thing look aged that it can but come near. This *Disciplina Arcani* is an occult quality to salve all difficulties by, and say what you will, these two emphatical words shall bear down all before them. And, I am persuaded, the following considerations will stand out against any attack but that of *Disciplina Arcani*.

I design two things: First, To shew the false dealing that has been used in putting forth the Councils. Secondly, To shew that Papists are not agreed in the authority of them as they are put forth.

PART I.

The false dealing that has been used in putting forth the Councils: and this, 1. By putting forth those that are wholly forged. 2. By suppressing those that are genuine. 3. By depraving those that are genuine, which they have not thought fit to suppress.

§. 1. By putting forth those that are forged. Of this number is the synod pretended to have been held at Antioch by the Apostles, the eighth canon whereof is produced for the worship of images; and the Council of Sinuessa brought by Bellarmine to prove the Pope above a General Council; which notwithstanding the improbability that three hundred and

three bishops could meet together under Diocletian,* and many other inconsistencies, yet must stand upon record as an authentic Council. The two Councils held at Rome under Silvester I. brought to establish the Pope's authority, and the last of them to warrant many other points of Popery, as chrism, the celibacy of the clergy, &c. though they have been detected of manifest forgery,† yet retain as good a place in the body of the Councils as ever; only the last canon of the second Roman Council was so palpable, that though it be very honourable for the Pope, yet Labbé could not but remark that perhaps it might be forged by Isidore Mercator; or at least, that the expression (*à Regibus*) was thrust in. To pass by the acts of the Council of Nice and the eighty Arabic canons, which some are willing to impose upon us for genuine, and quote them upon occasion; though Baronius confesses the acts supposititious, and all historians testify that the Nicene Fathers made but twenty canons: to pass by these and the early fraud and inexcusable mistakes of putting the Sardican canons into the number of the Nicene, to warrant the right of appeals to Rome, as well as the many contests about forged acts, that have been between the Greeks and Latins, which shall be inquired into when we come to the case of Photius: to mention, I say, no more of this kind; the Decretal Epistles, which cannot be denied to have been forged and imposed upon the world by Isidore Mercator, yet have not lost their place among the Councils, but stand there, as if they expected some second Turrianus to defend them: for unless more credit were designed them by it than they deserve, it is unaccountable why they should be suffered to take up so much room, which might be better filled. I conclude this particular with the observation of Richerius,‡ upon occasion of the forgery of an epistle from the Council of Nice to Pope Silvester, to desire his confirmation, *Equidem cum maximo animi mœrore dicere cogor nullos extare libros, in quibus tot tantæque fictitia et adulterina scripta quam in tomis Conciliorum legantur*, &c. "Indeed I am forced to say with exceeding great grief of mind, that there are no books in which there are so many and so egregiously counterfeit and spurious writings, as may be read in the tomes of the Councils."

* De Conc. lib. 2. c. 17. [vol. 2. p. 57. Pragæ, 1721. See Dupin's Eccles. History of 4th Century.]

† Vid Rob. Coci Censuram quorundam Scriptorum vers. firem.

‡ Hist. Conc. Gen. l. 1. p. 36. [p. 18. Cologne, 1683.]

§. II. By suppressing Councils that are genuine.* The first and second Councils of Pisa are omitted by all the collectors of Councils before Binius, and the acts of the second Council of Pisa are omitted by Labbe too :† though the Council of Constance was but a continuation of the first Pisan Council ; and the second being owned by the French in derogation to the last of Lateran, was published out of the French King's library with the former, by the special privilege of his Most Christian Majesty, A.D. 1612. And though Labbe thinks fit to excuse the omission by saying, that the acts and apology of this pretended Council (*Conciliabulum Pisanum*) were collected by schismatics and heretics, and published under a false name ; and that Lewis XII. in 1513, called it only a pretended Council, and denied it all favour and assistance, yet the royal approbation of this edition, and the exact agreement of all these acts, with the acts of the same Council, as we find them in Richerius, is a sufficient evidence against the imputation of forgery ; neither need they have been so very scrupulous upon this head, who have themselves inserted canons and synodical rescripts which they acknowledge to be spurious : but a lie when it makes for them, shall pass with a gentle censure ; whereas truth, when it makes against them, shall be stifled, if any thing like an excuse can be brought to palliate their proceedings.

As to Lewis XII. there is thus to be said : that he was engaged in a war with Julius II. the Venetians and the Spaniards at the same time, and gained a memorable victory at Ravenna over their united forces, but the English setting upon him at home, he was forced notwithstanding to give over in Italy, in 1513, and so it is not unlikely, that, to reconcile himself to the Pope, he might then send that message ; but it is manifest from the acts themselves, and the letters printed at the end of them, that from the beginning of the Council to that time, he could be no friend either to the Pope or to his Council. The same year Julius dies, and Leo X. succeeds. A peace being concluded with England, and Lewis taking in marriage Mary, sister to Henry VIII. he prepares for war again in Italy, but

[* The title of one of Bellarmine's chapters is *Concilia Generalia Reprobata*. De Concil. lib. 1. c. 6.]

[† The Council at Pisa was assembled by a few of the college of Cardinals, A.D. 1409. They summoned the two rival Popes, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. and deposed them. Gregory returned the compliment. After which Alexander V. was elected. Thus there were three rival Popes. Lab. Conc. vol. xi. 2102—2110.]

dies in 1515. From whence it evidently appears which Council Lewis was most for, and for what reason he disclaimed the Council of Pisa.

The Council of Basil is wholly left out in the Roman edition as spurious, and was left out by Cardinal Bellarmine's advice, as Richerius* was informed by those who were well acquainted with him: "Quod inceptum facinus quidem," says Richerius, "est absoluta dignum monarchia curiæ Romanæ, cui propositum est, quod jure non potest, id via facti consequi: Which action of theirs is worthy of the absolute monarchy of the Court of Rome, which is resolved to obtain that in fact, that they cannot defend in right." And it is remarkable that Sirmondus was the publisher of this edition; a man† so much suspected at Rome for too great integrity, that he was not allowed free access to their MSS. In the first draught of the Councils put out by Labbé, the Council of Basil was styled only *Concilium Basiliense*, whereas in Binius it is intituled *Concilium Œcumenicum ex parte reprobatum*, though in the same draught he gave the title of Œcumenical to that of Florence, and to the last of the Lateran; but perhaps the complaint that was then made of it by an advocate of Parliament, in a book intituled, the Pernicious Consequences of the New Heresy of the Jesuits, might give occasion to the alteration in the title of the Council of Basil; for we have it now printed as it is in Binius. But, as that author observes,‡ all means have been used to discredit the Council of Basil; insomuch that a list of the General Councils at the beginning of the epitome of canon law, by Antonius Augustinus, has been falsified, by leaving out the Council of Basil, which that learned archbishop had inserted among the rest, as may be seen: for after these words, *Constantiense sub Martino quinto*, there follows in the falsified editions, *Florentinum sub eodem*, which is ridiculous, the Council of Florence not having been held under Martin V.: but it sufficiently shews how the uncorrupted copies were, viz. after that of Constance, *Basiliense sub Eugenio*, and then *Florentinum sub eodem*. The *Concilium Delectorum Cardinalium*,§

* Rich. Hist. Conc. Gen lib. 111. c. 7. p. 669. [p. 212. Cologne, 1683]

† Cossart. Præf. ad Conc. [Labbe, Conc. xii. 459, et seq. xiii. 1—4. A.D. 1335.]

‡ New Heresy of the Jesuits, p. 140.

§ Consilium delectorum Cardinalium et aliorum Prælatorum de emendanda Ecclesia, S.D. N.P. Paulo Tertio, ipso jubente, conscriptum et exhibitum. Anno 1538

which was preparatory to the Council of Trent, and may well be reckoned a part of it, yet could never be admitted among the Councils since Grabbe's edition, 1551, since it is not in two other of his editions; though William Crashaw particularly complained of the omission in a printed letter to Binius,* and afterwards reprinted it himself; and it has been since published twice at Paris, once with the two Councils of Pisa, &c. 1612, and again lately with some pieces of Clemangis, Durandus *de modo celebrandi Concilii*, &c. But because that Council too fully sets forth what great necessity there was of a reformation *in capite et membris*, it has been excluded all the editions of Councils since Grabbe's time.

§. III. 1. By depraving the Councils which are genuine. And here we have reason to suspect much more than has hitherto been discovered; for in the Vatican library there have been certain men employed only to transcribe acts of the Councils, and copies of the Father's works, and in transcribing to imitate the ancient copies as near as is possible; as Dr. James,† of Oxford, was informed by a gentleman, who saw them at this work in the Vatican, and proffered to make oath of it, if need was. It has been long ago observed, that the last editions of the Councils are always the worst; so that Dr. Whitaker made it his earnest request to the Archbishop of Canterbury, that there might be some order taken for the preserving of Crabbe's edition, which he foresaw would never be printed again: and Dr. James‡ shews, that Crabbe himself is not without corruptions; which made him complain that no Protestant had put forth an edition of the Councils, or set himself to rectify the errors of Popish editions; but he says Dr. Ward, Master of Sidney College, in Cambridge, was then about it.

2. It is certain the *Indices Expurgatorii* reach MSS. as well as printed books,§ and it is as certain|| that the inquisitors of several places cannot agree among themselves; but Arias Montanus, who was himself a chief inquisitor in the Low Countries, has his own books put into the Roman Index; so

* Ad Severinum Binium Lovaniensem Theologum Epistola Commonitoria super Conciliorum Generalium editione ab ipso nuper adornata, &c. Londini, 1624.

† Tho. James's Treat. of the Corrupt. of Script. &c. in Append. to the Reader.

‡ James, *ibid* p. 102.

§ Possevin. Bibliothec. lib. 1. c. 12.

|| James, Index lib. prohibiti. a Pontificiis.

that nobody can tell whither this expedient of purgation* may come at last, or how it has already come: it is but mangling the old MSS. and then counterfeiting them in a new transcription, and the MSS. will all speak as they would have them. Laurentius Surius shewed* Junius what depravations he was to make in the edition of St. Ambrose, and assured him, that it would be the worst and most corrupt edition of that Father. And we cannot wonder if these practices had a great share in the motives to the conversion of Henricus Boxhornius,† who before was one of the principal expurgators. For some time these *Indices Expurgatorii*‡ were a great mystery, and the English Papists would not believe, but it was some trick of Beza's or Junius's to disgrace the Catholic cause. The *Index Expurgatorius*§ of Antwerp, was by chance first discovered by Junius, those of Spain and Portugal were never known till the taking of Calais, and the Roman Index was procured not without much difficulty. After all these discoveries, they could no longer complain of being misrepresented; though our English Papists were so backward in believing this part of Popery, that Crashaw|| was forced to be at the trouble of procuring two editions of Ferus upon St. John, one that had undergone the Index, and another that was printed before the invention of Indices, to convince them.

3. Let us now see what exploits have been done by these arts: the discoveries of Crashaw, and Coke, and Reynolds, but especially of James, in this kind will never be forgotten, and so need no repeating, any farther than they concern the Councils, to which I shall confine myself, and shew, that very material passages in them have been mangled or wholly omitted. It is very well known what attempts have been made to give us various readings of the sixth canon of Nice to procure the Pope's supremacy, and that for the same reason the fifth canon of the second General Council, and the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, have been rejected and branded as spurious. All the editions of Councils¶ bear that St. Cyril did preside in the Council of Ephesus, as Pope Celestine's deputy, against the authority

* Jun. Præf. ad. Ind. Expurg.

† Com. de Euchar. Harm. lib. 3. in principio

‡ W. Crashaw's Romish Forg. Pref.

§ James's Mystery of the Ind. Exp. p. 22.

|| Crashaw, ibid.

¶ James's Corrupt. of Script. &c. p. 91.

of the translation of Dionysius Exiguus, and the Greek MSS. as Dr. James witnesseth. But this is not the only forgery we meet withal in this Council. For in the Epistle of Celestine to that Council,* in the edition of Theodorus Peltanus, it runs thus: "We have sent Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a presbyter, to you, &c. who having taken our care upon themselves, shall be present at your acts, and shall confirm your decrees by their suffrage; and we doubt not but your Holiness will admit them to give their votes, and to a common consent; and let whatsoever you shall decree be looked upon as definitions and decrees made for the common tranquillity of the Church." † "Misimus ad vos Arcadium et Projectum episcopos, et Philippum presbyterum, &c. qui nostra in se cura suscepta, actis vestris intererunt, quæque a vobis sunt constituta suo calculo denuo confirmabunt: non dubitamus autem quin sanctitas vestra illos ad communem consensum sententiæque dictionem sit admissura; quæ vero decreveritis, ea pro omnium ecclesiarum tranquillitate habeantur definita decretaque." And with this edition of Peltanus agrees that of Antonius Contius, though his be a different version; whereas the Roman edition has it thus: "We have in our solicitude (for the peace of the Church) directed our holy brethren and fellow priests, &c. Arcadius and Projectus, &c. who may be present when every thing is done, and who may execute those things which have been before decreed by us; to whom we doubt not but your Holiness will give your assent, since what is done seems to be decreed for the security of the Universal Church." "Direximus pro nostra solitudine sanctos fratres et consacerdotes nostros, &c. Arcadium et Projectum, qui iis quæ aguntur intersint, et quæ antea a nobis sunt statuta exequantur; quibus præstandum a vestra sanctitate non dubitamus assensum, quando id quod agitur videtur pro Universalis Ecclesiæ securitate decretum." ‡ And according to the Roman edition is the Greek of Hieronymus Comelinus, A.D.

* [In the edition of Richerius' History, which I have referred to. Book first is dated 1683, and Books second, third, and fourth, are dated 1681.] Richer. Hist. Conc. Gen. lib. 1. c. 7. §. 9. [p. 155. Colon. 1683.]

† Ephes. Con. Act. 2. [vid. tom. 2. Ephesinæ Synodi, cap. 14. Collectiones Bini.]

‡ Edit. Rom. part. 2. act. 3. [quibus non discordat Græca editio Hieronymi Comelini. 1591, fol. 193.]

1591, and all the editions of the Councils ever since the Roman. It is very pleasant to observe, that Binjius, in his Notes upon the Council of Chalcedon, quotes the sentence against Dioscorus to prove the Pope's supremacy; and that it might be sure to make for his purpose, he quotes it otherwise than it is printed in his own edition, which, though Mr. Crashaw gave notice of it in his Letter to Binjius, yet remains unaltered still in Labbé's edition. Pithæus finds fault* with Surius for omitting the acts of the debate, which (after the fourth General Council of C. P. was concluded and subscribed) arose between the Eastern patriarchs and the Pope's legates, concerning the right of ordaining the Archbishop of Bulgaria: "*cujus altercationis non contemnenda Acta a Laur. Surio viro alioqui et diligentiae et fidei multae in postrema Conciliorum editione praetermissa fuisse, non injuria mæreor et doleo; sic enim sentio, quod bona omnium venia dictum velim, Christianam veritatem, quæ Deum autorem ac vindicem habet, sua simplicitate contentam non indigere illis artibus, quæ nec in humanis quidem actionibus bonus vir ac probus facile admiserit.*" and if he had lived to this day, he would have made the same or greater complaints: for Binjius and Labbé will scarce pass for honest men than Surius in this or in any other case.

4. But to come lower, where we may expect a more exact account of things. In the Council of Basil, the famous Lindwood† made an appeal upon account of temporalities of our kings. The like appeal was made by Thomas, bishop of Worcester, sent thither in commission from the King, and by Peter Partridge, chancellor of Lincoln, in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the whole clergy of the land; all which is omitted by the publishers of the Councils, and not put into the very last edition, though Dr. James had taken notice of the omission. I need not mention the decree which Caranza has bestowed upon the Council of Florence, to introduce the Apocrypha into the number of canonical books of Scripture,‡ though he is not the only man that has made use of this artifice, which they are now indeed ashamed of, as men always are of impostures when they are once discovered; yet still Caranza is the author readiest at hand, and is as constant a supply for Councils

* De Process. Sp. Sancti, p. 35.

† James, *ibid* p. 101.

‡ Cocci Censura. p. 246.

as the Breviaries are for Fathers. But I shall waive all other instances, and hasten to the Council of Trent, which gave the finishing hand to all the rest, and is itself no very eminent example of fair dealing. I take it to be no more an instance of the sincerity, than of the infallibility of that Council, that the Tridentine Fathers durst not trust the world with a view of their acts; and all the accounts we have had from private hands have been very little for its credit. The History of Palavicini has justly been said to be more prejudicial to the Council than that of Father Paul; for the latter only shews how much is to be said against it, whereas the former demonstrates how little can be offered in its defence. But not to insist upon this; who would suspect that the little Book of the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent might not be allowed us entire? * yet in the French edition, published at Paris in 1564, by Gentianus Hervetus, as soon as he came from the Council, and in the Antwerp edition of the same year, Cardinal Moroue, the Pope's legate, concludes the Council in these words, "Placuit omnibus patribus finem huic sacro Concilio imponi, confirmationemque a sanctissimo Domino nostro peti, tribus duntaxat exceptis, qui confirmationem se non petere dixerunt: ideoque nos Apostolicæ sedis Legati et Præsidentes eidem sacro Concilio finem imponimus: confirmationem vero quamprimum a sanctissimo Domino nostro petemus. Vos autem illustrissimi et reverendissimi Patres, post gratias Deo actas, ite in pace." "It pleased all the Fathers to put an end to this sacred Council, and to beg a confirmation from the Pope, excepting only three, who said they would not desire a confirmation; and therefore we, the legates of the Apostolic See, and the presidents of this holy Council, do put an end to it; and we shall beg a confirmation with all speed from the Pope. You, therefore, most illustrious and reverend Fathers, go in peace." But in the Roman edition, printed the same year by Manutius, these words, "Placuit omnibus patribus, &c. tribus duntaxat exceptis," &c. are left out; and after the question put to them by the legate, whether they would have request made to the Pope to confirm the Council? it is subjoined, *Responderunt, placet*: they all desire it; and there is no mention of the least dissent; and presently follows the dismissal of the Fathers.

* Vid. Richerium, lib. 4. part. 2. Hist. Gen. Conc. [p. 132. Colon. 1681.]

And after this manner have all the editions been printed ever since, without the least intimation that one bishop demurred upon it. * “Ex quo patet, curiæ Romanæ propositum esse omnia delere atque suppressere acta, quæ juribus suis usurpatis adversantur; et hinc etiam fit, ut multa Apocrypha pro veris legantur etiam in antiquis Conciliis.” “Whence it appears, that the Court of Rome is resolved to suppress and abolish all those acts which shall contradict their usurped rights; and hence it is that many spurious things are read as genuine, even in the ancient Councils.” I need pursue this subject no farther, nor seek for instances to make good this observation of Richerius; his testimony may suffice instead of a thousand instances. Nor shall I make any advantage of the many other great corruptions wherewith, partly through ignorance, partly with design, the monuments of antiquity are defaced, as the author of the preface to Paul the Fifth’s edition of General Councils complains, who was Sirmondus,† as Cossartius informs us; nor of the great alterations under that pretence made in innumerable places of the Roman edition, which have been retained ever since, besides the carelessness of the several publishers that has made the best editions extremely incorrect, which put Baluzius‡ upon a new collection. And we have some better hopes of him, if his skill in the Greek tongue qualify him for such a work, notwithstanding the sharp contest that has been between him and M. Faget concerning Peter de Marca’s posthumous works, or the undervaluing character§ lately given him by a doctor of the Sorbonne.

PART II.

§. I. PAPISTS are not agreed in the authority of Councils; I mean, they are not agreed what Councils are general, and what are not so. They differ as much about the Councils as they do about the Notes of the Church. For as Costerus assigns three, Coccius five, Bellarmine fifteen, Bozius a hundred Notes: so some assign more, some fewer General Councils; though the common computation proceeds no higher than to eighteen, of such as are without exception. As the seventh or eighth General Councils were not a long time received into the Professions of Faith (which I shew in the

* Richer. ib.

† Præf. ad Conc.

‡ Præf. ad Conc. tom. 1

§ Gerbais de Causis majoribus.

seventh), so the number of Councils recited in those Professions not exceeding eight, as is manifested by those Professions in the *Diurnus Romanus* published by Garnerius, shew, that eight only were looked upon as truly general, and the rest not as of equal authority. And as the form of the profession of faith in the Council of Constance (session 39) mentions but eleven General Councils in all, so it gives higher respect to the first eight than to the rest, and takes no notice of any more than one of Lateran and one of Lyons: "*Ego N. electus in Papam, omnipotenti Deo, cujus Ecclesiam suo praesidio regendam suscipio, et beato Petro Apostolorum principi, corde et ore profiteor, quam diu in hac fragili vita constitutus fuero, me firmiter credere et tenere sanctam fidem Catholicam secundum traditionem Apostolorum et aliorum sanctorum patrum, maxime autem sanctorum octo Conciliorum Generalium, viz. primi Nicæni, secundi Constantinopolitani, tertii Ephesini, quarti Chalcedonensis, quinti et sexti Constantinopolitanorum, septimi item Nicæni, octavi quoque Constantinopolitani; necnon Lateranensis, Lugdunensis et Viennensis, Generalium etiam Conciliorum. Et illam fidem usque ad unum apicem,*" &c. Cardinal Contarenus, in his short account of Councils written to Paul III., and presented to him on his calling the Council of Trent (or that of the delegated cardinals in order to it, he being one of the number), reckons that for the eighth General Council which deposed Photius, and the Council of Florence for the ninth, not so much as naming any of the Lateran Councils but the last, and not esteeming either this or that of Lyons under Gregory X., nor that of Constance or Basil, general, though he does name them.* Cardinal Pole, with his synod at Lambeth under Paul IV. A.D. 1556, calls the Council of Florence the eighth General Council, though they own the fourth Lateran under Innocent III. for general, as they do likewise the fifth Lateran.† They mention the fourth of Lateran frequently, and never but under the title of a General Council; and that of Lyons under Gregory X. they mention under the same character.‡ Abraham Cretensis,§ the first publisher of the

* Contarenus Sum. Conc. Edit. Venet. 1562.

† Decret. 2.

‡ Decret. 3.

§ Launoy, Epist. part. 8. ad Francisc. Bonum. [utque Generalis octavi Concilii jam pridem Florentiæ habiti acta, &c. Barthol. Abrah. Cretensis. Labbe, vol. 13. p. 1264. Paris, 1671.] [Binius was dishonest enough to change octavi into scxdecimi, to make it square with the Roman accounts.]

Council of Florence, gives it the title of the eighth General Council, and so the approbation of Clement VII. prefixed to that edition, styles it, and so Cardinal Pole with his clergy account it: so that this was the opinion of the members of the Council, and of the first publishers of it, and of our English clergy in Queen Mary's reign, whereas in the common account (new style) the Council of Florence is the sixteenth. Merlin gives us but eight General Councils, which are the first six with those of Constance and Basil. In the Vatican library, as it now stands, and was erected by Sixtus Quintus, A.D. 1588, where all the General Councils are represented in painting, with inscriptions to explain them, there are but two Lateran Councils, *viz.* those under Alexander III. and Innocent III. Roccha,* in his explications, reckons the Council of Vienna the fifteenth, and then proceeds to the Council of Florence, which he calls the eighteenth, as it is indeed, computing the two intermediate Councils of Constance and Basil; but Sixtus Quintus thought fit to take no notice of them in the Vatican, but Roccha makes them up a full score, though the Councils of Constance and Basil be only supposed, not expressed in the number. So many differing accounts we have concerning the number of General Councils; to which may be added one more, by taking in the Council of Arles, as it ought to be in St. Augustine's opinion, and in the opinion of Launoy, Albaspinæus, Marca, Labbé, Sirmondus, and others;† in which Council the Bishop of Arles presided to examine the cause of the Donatists, which had been before determined by the Bishop of Rome and his synod, they confirmed the judgment passed at Rome, but would have as certainly nulled it if the sentence had been wrong. The two latter editions of the Councils for awhile continue the tale of them, and the last continues it longer than the royal edition does; but afterwards they break off, and cease numbering, only giving us them as they come, which may be a farther evidence how little certainty and exactness there is in any thing that relates to a catalogue of General Councils. It seems, then, we are at last reduced to that notable expedient, which is said to have been in a late preachment proposed about the sacraments: "If we must have Councils, my beloved, let us take the greatest number, and then we are sure to have all:" and so for the

* Angelus Roccha, de Biblioth. Vatican. p. 200.

† Launoy, confirmat. dissert. de vera plenarii Concilii ap. Augustin. notione, p. 96.

largest Bible and the largest Creed, that we may be sure to have enough of whatever it be. But because Bellarmine's number of Councils seems to be most in vogue, I shall consider his eighteen, which he assures us are all over infallible and fully approved; whereas there are half a dozen that had the ill luck not to pass muster, though they are pretty tolerable in the main; and we must take part and leave part, as the Popes have thought fit; but there is a third sort so abominable, that they are utterly condemned.

§ II. I shall examine what agreement there is amongst Papists concerning the authority of the several approved General Councils. And here we need not go far. The second General Council* itself (as was before observed) has not escaped: for Baronius, A.D. 381, says, that the fifth canon of that Council was not received by the Church of Rome, and he suspects it is forged. Bellarmine says it was not consented to by the Pope,† and therefore void; so says Albertus Pighius‡ and Coriolanus.§ The four reasons which Baronius brings to invalidate its authority, Binius has transcribed into his notes, which Labbé and Cossartius have printed in their edition without the least censure or animadversion; but in the margin, over against the canon, add a note of their own, referring to some epistles of Leo, which are quoted by Baronius to disprove its authority. Now the only fault they can find with this canon is, that it makes the Bishop of C. P. next primate to the Bishop of Rome, for this reason, because that city was New Rome, which would make the Pope's power and greatness depend upon the pre-eminence that the city of Rome held in the empire, not upon any divine right. And for no better reason they reject the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon,|| and would undoubtedly have rejected all the canons of the first four General Councils, if they had stood in the way of the Pope's authority. For the fifth canon of C. P. is in all copies,

* The second General Council at Constantinop. circa A.D. 381. secundum Richer. part 1. c. 5. p. 169. [*Κανων γ. (III.) τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νεαν Ῥώμην.*]

† Lab. 2. de Rom. Pontif. c. 18.

‡ In Diatriba de Conc. 6. et 7. p. 279.

§ In Summa Concil.

|| The fourth General Council at Chalced. circa A.D. 451. Richer. part. 1. c. 8. p. 333. [s. 37. p. 225. Colon. 1683.] [Labbe, Concil. vol. iv. p. 1. 1003. Paris. 1671.]

and there is no more cause to suspect it than any other canon of that Council. The twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, with those that follow it, is wanting indeed in some copies; but this, as well as that of C. P. must be owned by all in the Church of Rome that hold a Council above the Pope; for if the major part of the Church is of sufficient authority to make them so, these canons are as authentic as any in all the volumes of Councils.* For the honour and jurisdiction of the patriarch of C. P. is founded upon the laws of the empire, and the consent of the universal Church, and these canons have generally been so far owned as to be inserted into the Books of Canons.

§. III. The fifth General Council held under the Emperor Justinian,† about the middle of the sixth century, was opposed by Pope Vigilius‡ to the utmost, till he was forced to submit and retract his heresy to recover himself from banishment. From whence a query will arise, how a Papist can be better assured that this Council is true than that it is false; or, whether a Council can be first false, and then, without the least alteration in its doctrine, infallible? or, how long time a Pope's sentence must be past before its effect of infallibility be produced? Whether one Pope may not retract another's sentence as well as the same Pope his own? And if so, whether Innocent XI. for instance, may not retract the sentence of Pius IV. and so vacate the Council of Trent?

§. IV. Albertus Pighius§ wrote a book|| on purpose to prove the sixth and seventh Councils both forged. The seventh was then newly published, but from what copy or upon what authority he says was unknown: Franciscus Turrianus undertook their defence. Bellarmine is for compounding the business, and is inclined to think that many forgeries¶ may indeed be crept in. Binius follows him, only he is more positive, as his manner is, to give us something that is his own:

* Du Pin. Dissert. 1. p. 57.

† The fifth General Council held at C. P. A.D. 552

‡ Baluz. Nova Collect. Conc. tom. 1. col. 1546. [Vid. Pet. de Marca, Dissert. de Epist. Vigili, 1708. col. 210 and Labbe, vol. v. p. 411, ut supra.]

§ The sixth General Council held at C. P. circa Ann. Dom. 689. [680.] vel ut alii putant 670. Richer. Hist. Conc. Hist. Gen. p. 1. c. 10. p. 525. p. 278. [Colon. 1683.] [Labbe, vol. 6. p. 587]

|| Diatriba de Conc. 6, 7.

¶ De Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 11. [vol. 1. p. 468. n. 18, 19. Præagæ, 1721.]

Labbé and Cossartius let his notes pass without censure. All the stir is, that the sixth Council condemned Pope Honorius for a heretic, and the seventh approves the sentence, and several times anathematizeth him, whom these men would willingly acquit, though there be as much evidence for it as there can well be for any matter of fact. The anathema against him was solemnly pronounced every year, till of late, on the festival of St. Leo II.; and every Pope anathematized him in the profession of faith which he made at his consecration, and sent it to the other bishops.* The arguments of Baronius, to prove the sixth Council corrupted, are now laughed at;† though F. Combefis‡ was violently treated by Raynaud, a Jesuit, not long ago, in a most malicious satire against the whole Dominican order, only because he had exposed Baronius on this subject. But Garnerius endeavours to palliate the matter, by saying, he was condemned only for favouring heretics, and conniving at them. Natalis Alexander formally proves,§ that he spake like a heretic, and acted like a heretic, and communicated with heretics; and yet at the same time proves he was no heretic. So impossible is it for Popes to be heretics! for any other bishop had certainly been an heretic, though he had done but half as much. But Du Pin|| has confuted all this sophistry; and so it is to be hoped, that now these Councils may be genuine in France, where Honorius is a heretic, or at least anathematized for a favourer of heretics; but of what credit they are at Rome as to this point, is easy to be imagined. He will scarce pass for a true Catholic there, who had not rather part with two Councils than one Pope.

§. V. But here we must not omit the dispute betwixt the Greeks and the Latins concerning the Council in Trullo,¶ called *Synodus Quinisexta*, because it was a kind of supplement to the fifth and sixth Councils. The Greeks maintain against the

* Garnerii Liber Diurnus in professione Fidei, secunda dissert. in eandem; et Launoi Epist. part. 5. ep. 2. p. 12, &c. [The ceremony of the election of the Pope was always in the early editions of the Pontificale Romanum. It is now omitted. It is found in the Libri Sacrarum Cereonomarum, Venice, 1516. See Meutham's Plus V.]

† Du Pin, Dissert. 5. p. 350.

‡ New Heresy of the Jesuits, p. 91.

§ Sec. 7.

|| Dissert. 5 p. 349.

¶ Synodus Quinisexta in Trullo, circiter Ann. Dom. 681. secundum Labbé, in tom Conc. [The date of this Council, called Council in Trullo, and Concilium Quinisextum, is given as 691, 692, and 707. Labbé, vol. 6. p. 1124, ut supra.]

Latins, that this Council was general; they allege that the Pope's legates were present, and subscribed its canons, which the Pope himself indeed afterwards refused to do; but the Council styles itself general; and if want of the Pope's approbation could hinder it from being so, it was some time before the fifth could deserve that title, however it came by it at last; but the greatest fault of this Council in Trullo is, that it approves* and confirms the second canon of C. P. and the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, in which the Latins are *καριώως πληττόμενοι*, as Balsamon observes. However, the hundred and two canons of this synod are cited in the second Council of Nice.† And Adrian I. in his epistle to Tarasius says, that he receives the sixth Council with all its canons, by which he can mean no other but this; for the sixth, as it is distinguished from this, made no canons. Nicholas I., in an epistle to Michael the Greek emperor, says, that they were confirmed by Pope John VII. at the request of Justinian II. whom that Pope commends there as a most holy emperor; besides, Gratian attributes them to the sixth Council, and so does the Council of Florence.‡ All which was so convincing to Caranza,§ that he sets them down as the canons of the sixth General Council; and after him Sylvius chose rather to distinguish and refine upon the thirty-sixth canon, than to reject them all. Angelus Roccha|| says plainly, it was a continuation of the former Synod, not a new one, since both were subscribed by the same bishops, as he proves out of the second Council of Nice.

§ VI. 1. The second Council of Nice,¶ which is the seventh General Council, is a Council they find themselves as much concerned to defend as any of them all, and have had as much trouble in defending it; unless this be general, the worship of images is at a great loss for authority from antiquity; and yet to defend this Council is almost as difficult as to defend the worship of images without it.

2. Gregory the Great** is well known to have been against the worship of images; but his successors, not long after, were for promoting it what they could; so zealous they were

* Can. Trull. 36.

† Act 4, 5, 6.

‡ Sess. 5.

§ Sum. Conc.

|| Bibl. Vatic p 71.

¶ The second Council of Nice. A.D. 781. vol. 785. secundum Labbe. [vol. 7. pp. 1—963.]

** Lab. 9. Ep. 9. [Epist. ad Serenum, lib. 9. Ep. 9. Labbe, vol. v. p. 1370, ut supra.]

in the cause, that great contentions arose between the *Iconoclastæ* and the *Iconolatæ*; for no wonder if some were moved to break those images, which they could not but abhor to see others worship. These heats* grew to that height, that the Emperor Leo III. forbade, by his edict, the worship of images, following herein the example of two of his predecessors, and commanded them to be removed out of all churches, considering that the lawful use and ornament of images might much better be spared, than the worship of them suffered.† Gregory II. upon this calls a Council at Rome, determines for image-worship,‡ and anathematizeth the Emperor; and moreover forbids that taxes or tribute should any longer be paid to him from Rome, or any other part of Italy: in short, he denies obedience to him, and betakes himself to the Franks. Leo Isaurus being dead, his son Constantinus Copronymus calls a Synod at C. P. in which the worship of images is condemned in 754. In this state§ things continued till about 780, when the Empress Irene, being left a widow by the death of Leo IV. with her young son Constantine VI. resolved to call another Synod at C. P. to null the late Council held there under Constantinus Copronymus, and to determine for the worship of images; but the people and the soldiery of the city would endure no such thing, and they had most of their own bishops so far on their side, as to instruct and encourage them against such worship. The citizens were not difficultly persuaded to be constant in their old profession, which edicts, and Councils, and their own practice, required them not to abandon; but they were led by too violent a zeal to betake themselves to a way not justifiable, and, together with the soldiers, were immediately in an uproar upon these proceedings of the Empress. The Council was forced to adjourn to Nice, no fewer than three hundred and fifty bishops in number, and there they did the business the following year. There were none from the West in it, but the Pope's two legates; and such was the

* Cedren. Hist. Zonar. Annal.

† Cedren. p. 453.

‡ This some attribute to Gregory III. who, Platina says, excommunicated and deposed Leo: Hic statim ubi Pontificatum iniit, Cleri Romani consensu Leonem Tertium, imperatorem Constantinopolitanum imperio simul et communione fidelium privat, quod sacras imagines e sacris ædibus abraisset, et statuas demolitus esset, quodque etiam de Homonsio male sentiret. Platina in Greg. Tert. So natural is it for every one to be made an heretic, who withstands the corruptions and innovations of the Church of Rome.

§ Conc. tom. 7. col. 655.

|| Con. tom. 7. col. 55.

freedom used in their debates, that the bishops who had been against images, abjure in the beginning of the Council, and so are admitted to take their places in it.* This happened 787, as the last editors compute it. Adrian I. sent his legates thither, who brought a copy of the acts home with them signed by Constantine and Irene; those the Pope procured to be turned into Latin,* and put them into his own library: they were not so confined there, but they soon caused no small debate in the Western Church. The Pope sends them to Charles the Great,† to be examined and approved by him and his bishops. The Emperor opposed them, and either wrote himself against them, or however sent a confutation to Adrian, and caused it to be published by his authority; whether this was written in the Council of Frankfort, as Bellarmine and Baronius suppose, or after it, or before it, has been doubted. Labbé and Cossartius place it in the same year with the Council of Nice, and Adrian‡ styles it only a Capitular, without taking notice that a Council had any thing to do in it, which he would scarce have omitted of a Council in which his own legates were present, and dissented from the rest of the bishops, as Baronius and Bellarmine imagine, or if they had agreed with them, yet this probably had been intimated either by the Emperor or the Pope. But that which puts this controversy beyond all dispute is, that the book itself informs us,§ that the Synod in Bithynia, against which it is written, was held not quite three years before, whereas the Council of Frankfort was held seven years after that of Nice; so that the book was writ above four years before the Council of Frankfort. However this be, the Pope sets himself to answer it from point to point,|| and scorns to stick at any thing: where that Council of Nice says, that as the people of Israel were healed by looking upon the brazen serpent, so we, beholding the images of saints, shall be saved; he goes on to defend it at any rate, "for the satisfaction of unbelievers, and the direction of the Franks." His best proof is a hearty exclamation or two, *Ænei serpentis inspectione credimus Israeli-*

* Anastas. in Adrian I. p. 172, 173.

† Hincmar. Rhemens. ad Laudunens. cap. 20.

‡ Ep. ad Carolum M. pro Synodo Nicæna II. Conc. vol. 7. [Vid. Roger Hoveden. Anal. p. 1. Ann. 792. cited by Bull in Corruptions of Church of Rome, vol. 2. p. 279 of his works.]

§ Opus Carolinum, p. 7.

|| Pro Syn. Nic. II. in Actione 5. c. 26. p. 927.

ticum populum a calamitate injecta liberari, Christi Dei nostri et sanctorum effigies aspicientes atque venerantes dubitamus salvari? "We believe that the people of Israel were freed from the calamity that was thrown upon them, by looking upon the brazen serpent, and shall we doubt of salvation, if we look with veneration upon the images of Christ our Lord, and the saints?" Strange indeed!* this must needs raise strong passions, especially in his *honey* Emperor, as he calls Charles the Great in his Epistle prefixed to his defence of the Council: but his arguments are not so powerful; all the pathetics he could use, would not persuade them to speak one word to the purpose, as any one may discern, that will but be at the pains to peruse them. One Basilius, an archbishop, had, it seems, in a profession of faith, which he read in the Council, inserted, after the belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the kissing and adoring of images and relics: adding, that he believed that sanctification was partaken of from these, and leaving out in the mean time the articles of remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and life everlasting. The Pope resolved to defend all,† and not to stand out in the least at anything whatsoever, justifies Basilius, that sanctification may be had from images and relics; and afterwards maintains,‡ that a man had better visit all the stews in the city, than refuse to adore the image of our Lord, or of the blessed Virgin. But how stout a champion soever the Pope was for the Council of Nice, the Emperor was not in the least satisfied; he was for good sense rather than honey words, and therefore calls a Council at Frankfort 794, consisting of three hundred bishops, who determined so unanimously against the Council of Nice, that Bellarmine and Baronius think the *Opus Carolinum*, which Adrian endeavoured to answer, was drawn up there. The Pope had his legates in the Council; but they were either brought to a consent with the rest of the Fathers, or however could get nothing by their opposition, which perhaps might be the less peremptory and pertinacious, and so the less regarded, because the Emperor himself was present.

3. Thus we see, that not only the acts of the seventh General Council have lately been called in question, but that the Council itself was at first opposed by as General a Council

* Unde pro nimio amore, quem erga vestram mellifluam gerimus regalem excellentiam—unde pro vestra melliflua regali dilectione.

† Ibid. in Act. 1. cap. 4. col. 942.

‡ Ibid. Act. 4. col. 949.

held at Frankfort soon after; and, which is strange, the same Pope's legates were present at both, and the Pope himself sent his letters to both, and, if we believe Binius, confirmed both. For he would persuade us, that the second Nicene Council was confirmed, not condemned by this of Frankfort; though nothing can be more plain, than that the second canon condemns the worship of images in contradiction to a Greek Synod, which had commanded it under pain of anathema; and herewith agree all the ancient writers,* Hincmarus, Aimoinus, Regino, Ado, Abbas Urspergensis; besides, the books which go under the name of Charles the Great purposely written against that Council of Nice, appear to have been written in the time of that Emperor, both from the answer to them by Adrian, and from Hincmarus's testimony. Bellarmine and Baronius could not resist so strong a conviction, but were both forced to confess, that the Council of Frankfort had condemned this of Nice; they were ashamed to say bluntly, that either these books were corrupted, or the authors lied; this was too coarse for Bellarmine and Baronius, though Copus, Surius, and Sanders made no scruple of it, and Binius† here leaves the two cardinals, his usual guides, to follow these. But Bellarmine and Baronius were men of more sleight and finesse, than to make use of so confident an argument; they acknowledge that the Council of Nice was condemned at Frankfort; but, say they, the Fathers of Frankfort were imposed upon, they knew not that the Pope had confirmed the Council of Nice, and besides mistook the sense of that Council. Sirmondus‡ here falls in with Bellarmine and Baronius, well knowing that they had pitched upon the only thing that could, with any tolerable colour, be said in the case; for he owns the books of Charles the Great, and the canons of Frankfort, to be now generally accounted genuine beyond all dispute among learned men. And thus much Maimburg and Natalis Alexander cannot deny, that they were written by that Emperor himself, or by his order.

4. But first, what did the legates do there, if they could not acquaint the bishops, that the Pope had approved the Synod of Nice? how could they be ignorant of what the Pope had done on so important an occasion, or what the doctrine was, which he had confirmed? They were very extraordinary men,

* Bellarmine, de Concilio, lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 886.

† Vid. not. ad Concilium.

‡ Admonit Conc. vol. 7. col. 1054.

and their instructions were extraordinary, if they knew no better what they came about. Besides, the author of the *Opus Carolinum** supposes the Pope and Tarasius patriarch of Constantinople agreed upon the point of images. He was not unacquainted with the distinction of the Nicene Council between the worship due to images,† and that due to God himself; and he frequently makes use of Greek,‡ which shews he was no such stranger to that tongue, but that he might very well inform himself, as it appears he had done, what the Nicene doctrine was: whether this book was composed by Alcuinus, or by Ingilramnus, or by whomsoever else, is not much material to my present purpose; but if it were writ in the Council of Frankfort, as Bellarmine and Baronius think, or before it, as appears from the book itself,§ or though it were writ afterwards, yet can it be supposed that all the bishops at Frankfort, with the exception of the Emperor, whose name this work bears, should be so great strangers to the doctrine of Nice, so fully set forth and confuted in this book? Bellarmine indeed says, the book gives a wrong account of the doctrine; but it is plain he gives a wrong account of the book; for it does as accurately distinguish betwixt *latría* and *doulía*|| as Bellarmine himself, and then proves that neither of them may be given to images. That the Council of Frankfort could be ignorant of the doctrine established at Nice, can seem probable to no man, who considers, that the Pope had caused the canons of Nice to be translated into Latin, that his legates were present at Frankfort, and that they refused to consent to the decree of that Council, as Bellarmine and Baronius affirm. To imply that the bishops at Frankfort did not understand Greek, might pass well enough from Sirmondus, but might have been spared by men of no greater accuracy in that tongue than the two cardinals. If not one among them all were skilled in the Greek, yet why could they not read the translation? why could they not consult the legates? The cardinals perhaps might be sensible enough how liable men are to mistakes for want of a little Greek, and Anastasius¶ says, the translation was very perplexed, and hardly intelligible; but I can never be persuaded that the legates should stand by and deny their consent, and yet not endeavour to undeceive the Council, and at least advise them to send to Rome for instructors. Pope

* P. 180.

† P. 88.

‡ P. 257, 258, 275, 293, 401.

§ P. 7.

|| P. 88.

¶ Præfat. in septim. Synod. Concl. tom. 7. col. 29.

Adrian wrote himself in defence of the Synod of Nice, which he had confirmed, and so must be allowed to understand it, and Greek could then be no very strange language at Rome, nor consequently at Frankfort neither, among three hundred bishops gathered together from all parts of the west, when the Pope had so lately renounced his allegiance to the Greek Emperor, and yet still a correspondence was held between Rome and C. P. by Adrian with Constantine and Irene, and Tarasius,* as appears by their letters.

5. But it is in vain to argue from probabilities, if the canon itself, as is pretended, be grounded upon a mistake. “Allata est in medium quæstio de novâ Græcorum Synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopoli fecerunt, in qua scriptum habebatur, ut qui imaginibus sanctorum ita ut Deificæ Trinitati servitium, aut adorationem non impenderet, anathema judicaretur; qui supra Sanctissimi Patres nostri omnimodis orationem aut servitutem eis impendere renuentes, contempserunt atque consentientes condemnaverunt.” “The question about the new Greek Synod held at C. P. about worshipping of images, was then debated; therein it was written, that whosoever should not pay that service or adoration to the images of saints, which he would pay to the blessed Trinity, should be anathematized: whereby our holy Fathers by all means refusing to pray to them, or pay them service, despised and unanimously condemned it.” Here is first C. P. mistaken for Nice; and then it is said that the same worship is under anathema commanded to be given to images, which is given to the blessed Trinity. Sirmondus† is so ingenious as to propose a way of reconciling the first mistake of C. P. for Nice, by supposing that the Synod is said to have been at C. P. not that it was held in that city, but because it was in the *Constantinopolitan* empire, and at the command of the Greek Emperor Constantine and his mother Irene. This, I must confess, seems to me strained; but it were yet a greater force upon the imagination to be told, that Charles the Great, with three hundred bishops, met together to condemn the worship of images, decreed in a General Council about seven years before, should yet not be certified where this decree was made, nor be able to distinguish Nice from C. P. and that the same Pope should send his legates to both Synods, and yet give them no better instructions, than to

* Concil. tom. 7.

† Not. in Concil. Francoford. Conc. vol. 7. col. 1066.

suffer them to be ignorant in so late a matter of fact, which must be known all over Europe. For when the worship of images, which had undergone so much debate, and had been the cause of so great troubles, and occasioned the calling divers Councils, but had never the good luck to succeed, was at last in a General Council enjoined under anathema: and when the Pope's legates, at their coming from the Council, brought a copy of it subscribed by Constantine and Irene, which the same Pope, that now sent his legates to Frankfort, commanded to be translated into Latin, and placed in his library, when the Pope himself had answered the objections proposed by the Emperor against this very Council of Nice, who can conceive that the whole transaction should not be noised abroad, and talked of in all places, and among all persons, and in all its circumstances so exactly known, that it would have been impossible to have picked out three hundred men, of any tolerable rank and conversation, who could be ignorant, that the General Council of Nice had at length decided the vexatious controversy about images? If its judgment had been acquiesced in as infallible, or but of sufficient authority to enforce any submission upon the conscience, it certainly had been taken more notice of, than to be unknown to any man of ordinary observation in its less material circumstances of time and place, and number of bishops; the doctrine however had been taught and practised everywhere among all sorts of people; or, if it had been rejected by some, yet these would have found themselves obliged to give an account why they rejected it, and so to inquire thoroughly into it. But to suppose so many Western bishops, with the Pope's legates among the rest, and the Emperor himself in the midst of them, so grossly and even stupidly ignorant, as to know neither the doctrine itself, nor the place where the Synod was held but seven years before, is to cast too great a blemish upon the Western Church, and would be apt to make men suspect, that the Western clergy at that time could make no pretence to the least share of infallibility either in a Council, or out of it. The Emperor's book mentions the Greek Council as held in Bithynia; and it were extreme weakness to imagine, that Charles the Great, after he had been at the pains to write a book upon the subject, or had ordered one to be written, had not intelligence good enough to set the Synod right in the circumstance of place at least, if any will be so free with him, as to say he was rash enough to oppose he knew not what.

6. But to free that wise and great Emperor, and the whole Western Church from so stupid an absurdity : It can be no wonder that the decree concerning image-worship should be related in the Council of Frankfort as made at C. P. to him, who remembers that the first meeting of the Nicene Fathers was at C. P. and that there first they began to anathematize those who were against the worship of images ; but finding C. P. too hot for them, were forced to remove to Nice. And this may give a farther account, why the doctrine condemned in the canon of Frankfort, doth not so exactly agree with the definition made at Nice, where it is probable they might think fit to be more moderate and cautious in their expressions, after they had experience how ill the doctrine of image-worship was thought of at C. P. and with how great difficulty it was like upon any terms to be received. The Council of Frankfort might be content to use the like moderation, and not directly to oppose that Council in the face of his legates, which had after a sort been defended by the Pope himself, since it was sufficient in the end of the canon to add such a clause as excludes all worship of images whatsoever : “ *Qui supra sanctissimi Patres nostri omnimodis orationem aut servitutem eis impendere renuentes contempserunt atque consentientes condemnarunt.*” They might not be unwilling to spare the name of a Council that had gone before them in condemning the heresy of Felix and Elipandus ; and after the dispute between the Emperor and the Pope, the Emperor might perhaps think fit to try this expedient for an accommodation of a thing that had been of so ill consequence, and so might give order to omit the mention of Nice, and not to engage the Pope’s legates at Frankfort to condemn the same Pope’s legates at Nice, but nevertheless to have the thing itself condemned as effectually, as if all the Fathers of Nice had been particularly named. For it is observed, that Charles the Great, and his son Lewis after him, had particular care to give the Popes good words, and to keep fair with them, when they most withstood their designs ; and thus Lewis carried it in this very case of images, when the worship of them was condemned in the Council of Paris. This is the account which to me seems most probable ; but however, that the Nicene Council was condemned not only at Frankfort, but generally in the West, and shortly after in the East too, is as clear as the light. Maimburg and Natalis Alexander are so hard put to it, after all their endeavours to palliate and reconcile these two Councils,

that they are forced to pretend that Charles the Great was enraged at Constantine, the Greek Emperor, because he refused to marry his sister, and so in revenge called this Council at Frankfort in opposition to Constantine's Council at Nice, and the images and image-worshippers, it seems, suffered all the hard names and bad usage at Frankfort, because Constantine loved images better than the lady. An honourable revenge for Charles the Great to vent his spleen upon the poor images, which, I suppose, were all against the match. But the captious and frivolous cavils of those two writers are particularly and fully answered by Spanhemius,* and are not much material to be here considered.

7. It is certain the Council of Nice had been before condemned in Britain,† and Alcuinus had written against it, and in the name of the princes and bishops had sent a censure of it to the Emperor, together with the acts of the Council, which the Emperor had before sent into Britain; and this probably was the first draught of the *Opus Carolinum*, which Adrian replied to. A synod at Paris, owned by Sirmondus and Mabillon,‡ notwithstanding Bellarmine's pretended confutation, condemned image-worship and the second Council of Nice, with the two Epistles of Adrian, one to Charles the Great in defence of it, and another to Constantine and Irene to persuade them to call it. Adrian wrote his defence for the direction of the Franks, and Anastasius informs us,§ that the French were not reconciled to this Council, nor to the worship of images in his time; and not only Mabillon but Bellarmine|| himself confesses, that Jonas Aurelianensis, Agobardus, and generally the French writers of that age, were against the worship of images, and condemned the Council of Nice, which likewise had been done in the beginning of this century, 814, in a Council at C. P. called by Leo Armenius; yet the ambassadors from the Greek Emperors to Lewis le Debonnaire in 824, complain of the horrible abuses that were then got into that Church, that the Greeks had thrown down crosses in their churches, and set up images in their room; that they lighted candles before them, and offered incense to them; that they adored them with singing hymns to them, and asking help of them, and, by a most ridiculous

* Hist. Imag. sect. 6, & 7.

† Mabillon, Præf. ad Acta sanctorum Benedict. part. 1. sect. 4. p. 15.

‡ Tom. Concl. 7. Mabillon, ibid.

§ Præf. ad Synod. 7.

|| Bellarmin. Script. Eccl. in Jonas Aurelianens. Mabillon, ib. p. 16.

superstition, made them godmothers to their children, and that some priests had dared to do what cannot be mentioned without horror; they scraped off the paint from images, and mingled it with the wine in the sacrament; and had been guilty of other such-like abuses. Others put the sacramental bread into the hands of images, and from them received the communion, and others forsook the churches, and in private houses made use of tables set before images to consecrate the sacrament upon. It was on this occasion,* that Lewis le Debonnaire called the Council above-mentioned at Paris, wherein a book was compiled to shew, that images are not at all to be worshipped, which he sent to the Pope, but with order to mitigate some passages, and to manage the controversy so dexterously, as to give least offence to his Holiness. These proceedings had such success, that Nicholas I., in his Council held at Rome, and in the relation he gives of it to Michael the Emperor, and Adrian II., in his Epistle to Carolus Calvus, mentions but six General Councils, the seventh not being then received into the number, not because it was not yet turned into good Latin, as the annotator would persuade us,† but because it was not thought to contain sound doctrine; for since it was confirmed by the Pope, what prejudice could that be to the reception, though it had been in a tongue as unknown to the priests, as that which their prayers are in is to the people? When Ado, archbishop of Vienna, in the profession of faith, which, upon his promotion to that see, he sent to Nicholas I., declared that he approved the four General Councils, making no mention of the rest, Nicholas, notwithstanding, sends him the pall; but withal writes to know what he thought of the fifth and sixth Councils, not requiring him to say anything of the seventh.‡ And indeed all the patriarchs of the East, except the patriarch of C. P. used to make mention, in their Synodical Epistles, but of six General Councils, as the Encyclica of Photius shews, and as Baronius,§ who first published it, does not gainsay. Which made the author of the *Annales Berliniani* observe,|| that the eighth synod had defined concerning images contrary to what the orthodox had defined before. For the controversy about images was again under debate at C. P. when Nicholas I. sent his legate thither,¶ and their

* Mabillon, ib. p. 15, 24.

† Mabillon, ibid. p. 27.

|| Mabillon, ibid. p. 27.

† Vid. Conc. vol. 8. p. 287. 774.

§ Tom. 10. ad Ann. 863 p. 247.

¶ Nichol. I. Epist. Conc. vol. 8.

chief business was to decide it ; for they were to act nothing in the cause of Photius, but only to inquire how things had been managed. Afterwards, under Adrian II. 870, while the eighth General Council was sitting, there appears to have been another synod opposing the worship of images, which they anathematize ; and it was one part of their business to establish that worship.* So that this Council of Nice was received neither in the East nor in the West, during one century after it was held. Nay, it has been lately shewn, that till the fifteenth century the veneration of images was rejected by the most eminent persons of the Western Church.† Afterwards images and the Council of Nice had a blessed time of it, and the people grew fond of these which they call laymen's books, when their priests could scarce read any other. And though it may well be expected, that the extravagance of this dotage should be much abated since the Reformation, especially in France, where Popery is new modelled and refined to that degree ; yet even there sober men complain and lament, but cannot remedy the excess of it in our days.‡

§. VII. 1. There are no fewer than four Councils which lay claim to the title of the eighth General Council,§ and the Pope was present either in person, or by his legates, in them all. Three of these were held at C. P. The first, 861, in which Ignatius, patriarch of C. P., was deposed ; the next, 870, in which he was restored, and Photius deposed ; the third, 879, when, after the death of Ignatius, Photius was again placed in that see. The fourth|| which goes under the name of the eighth General Council, is that of Florence, of which I shall forbear to speak till I come to it in order.

2. The Council of C. P. which condemned Photius, is esteemed the eighth General Council by the Latins generally, and that which restored him, by the Greeks, by Zonaras, Balsamon, Psellus Nilus, &c., Marcus Ephesinus,¶ in the Council of Florence, maintains, in the name of the whole Greek Church,

* Τῷ ἐν φρναττομένῳ συνεδρίῳ κατὰ τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων ἀνάθεμα. Conc. tom. 8. col. 1360.

† Fallibility of the Church of Rome demonstrated from the second Council of Nice, c. 4. sess. 6.

‡ Mabil. ib. p. 28. et Richer. Hist. Gen. Conc. lib. 1. cap. 11. sect. 13.

§ The eighth General Council, or the fourth Council of C. P. Ann. 870. The dates of these three Councils are according to Labbe's edition.

|| Vid. Not. ad Conc. C. P. 4. col. 1491. Conc. vol. 8.

¶ Sess. 6. in principio.

that the Council of C. P. which restored Photius, had nulled the Council which the Latins called the eighth General Council, in which Ignatius was restored, and Photius deposed, and that this Council was confirmed by John VIII.; and that in the same synod it was determined, that the addition of *Filioque* should be taken out of the Creed, and therefore from that time in the Great Church at C. P. they used, he says, to denounce anathema* to whatever had been written or spoken against the holy patriarchs, Photius and Ignatius. To this the Cardinal Julian, with whom Marcus Ephesinus had the dispute, could find nothing to reply, for which he is very much blamed by another cardinal, who never was at such a loss but he always had something to say; I mean Baronius. It is plain the Bishop of Rhodes, who in the next session undertook to answer Marcus Ephesinus, knew very little of the matter; for he pretends to speak only of probabilities: λέγω ὅτι τοῦτο παντάπασιν φαίνεται οὐκ εὐλογον. "I say that this does not by any means seem probable." He objects, that the Pope nor his legates did not preside in Photius's Council, as if the Greeks had ever thought that necessary; he makes no exceptions against any particulars in the acts of the synod, as not authentic, but would prove in general, that there never was such a synod, because the Pope nor his legates did not preside in it; "for if they had," argues he, "there would have been some remembrance of that synod in the Latin Church;"† whereas the Epistles and Commonitorium of John VIII. shew, that there was such a synod, and that his legates did preside in it; and Baronius proves that his legates, for their compliance, were excommunicated at their return to Rome.

3. Nor is it a pretence of the Greeks only, that this, styled the fourth Council of C. P. wherein Photius was condemned, is vacated; but the Epistles of Pope John VIII. to this very purpose, are cited by Ivo Carnutensis‡ in his collection of de-

* Ἀπὸ τότε γοῦν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἀναγινώσκεται ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως οὕτως. "Ἀπαντα τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατριαρχῶν Φωτίου καὶ Ἰγνατίου γραφέντα, ἢ λαληθέντα, ἀνάθεμα. Marc. Ephes. in Conc. Flor. sess. 6. col. 87. Conc. vol. 13.

† Εἰδ' ἦν τοῦτο, ὁμολογουμένως ἀν ἦν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Λατίνοις μνήμη τις περὶ τῆς συνόδου ἐκείνης. Ib. col. 127.

‡ Part. 4. cap. 76, 77. Constantinopolitanam Synodum eam, quæ contra Photium facta est, non esse recipiendam. Joannes 8. Patriarchæ Photino; illam, quæ contra Photium facta est, Constantinopolitanam Synodum irritam fecimus, et omnino delevimus, tum propter alia, tum

crees. "The Constantinopolitan synod which was made against Photius, is to be rejected. John VIII. to Photius the patriarch : We have vacated and entirely abolished the Constantinopolitan synod, which was made against Photius, as well for other reasons, as because Pope Adrian did not subscribe in it. Of the same thing, John to his Apocrisiarii : Ye shall say, that we vacate and dash out of the number of the holy synods, all those synods which were held against Photius under Pope Adrian at Rome or at Constantinople." The same author, in his prologue or preface, quotes another of Pope John's epistles at large, written to the Eastern Churches ; wherein he tells them, that they had been too hasty in restoring Photius without his knowledge ; but for all that, he was well enough contented, and brings several arguments to shew that Photius might be restored, notwithstanding any sentence which had passed upon him. He there compares Photius's case not with that of the Donatists, but of St. Athanasius, St. Cyril, and Polychronius ; of St. Chrysostom and Flavianus : and then concludes, that if the Donatists, who had been cast out of the Church by a General Council,* had yet been received into communion by another Council, much more ought men of an orthodox faith and an unblameable life, not to be condemned, but restored to their former dignity ; which must suppose Photius to be a man of an orthodox faith and an unblameable life ; or else we must suppose his arguments nothing to the purpose. But he proceeds to say, that his predecessors Nicholas and Adrian had been imposed upon, and that all that had been done against Photius, was to be accounted as if it had been never done. Nor does this depend upon Ivo's authority only, but the second canon of the Council which restored Photius, is inserted by Gratian as a canon of the eighth General Council, for which he is severely handled by Baronius, though others of the Roman communion† have been wavering

quoniam Adfianus Papa non subscripsit in ea. De eodem Joannes Apocrisiarius suis, Dicitis, quod illas Synodos, quæ contra Photium sub Adriano Papa Romæ vel Constantinopoli sunt factæ, cassamus, et de numero sanctorum Synodorum delemus.

* Nullus excuset pro Synodis contra eum peractis, nullus sanctorum Prædecessorum meorum Nicolai et Adriani sententias contra eum cause-tur : De ipso enim subreptum est illis, nullus contra eum subscriptiones vestras occasionem Schismatis habeat : omnia enim ut infecta et irrita facinus, &c. Ivo Carnut. Prolog. p. 5.

† Rader. apud Binium, Conc. vol. 8. col. 1496.

as to this matter, and have written uncertainly and confusedly about it; and Innocent III.* himself quotes the same second canon in his Epistles.

4. Baronius notwithstanding, Raderus and Possevin, whose arguments Binius has collected in his notes, and generally the whole Roman Church, are for maintaining the authority of this fourth Council of C. P., and this is the last of the eight General Councils, which every Pope is sworn to at his consecration.† They argue, that the acts of the Council which restored Photius, are corrupted; which is a sure argument when there is nothing else to say: well, but they prove it from John's Epistles, which are quite another thing in the Vatican MSS. than they are in these acts; but how does it appear that these Epistles are more authentic than the acts? why, because these have been abused by Photius; and how does that appear? because Photius was a villain; as he was indeed one of the greatest monsters of impiety that ever lived, if all be true that his enemies relate of him. They say that his mother, when she went with child of him, dreamed that she should bring forth a serpent, which, with his noisome breath, should infect the whole East: and many holy men foretold the same thing in plainer language to her, that she should be delivered of one who would be the ruin of the Church: this troubled her so much, that she often endeavoured to destroy herself rather than that such a brat should ever be born into the world, but her husband prevented the design; and she was at last persuaded by devout people about her to submit to the providence of God: so she was prevailed with to live, and, to her great sorrow, was mother of a son who outwent all these prophecies. For the legend must not end here: he was an impostor and used enchantments; he got Ignatius removed out of his patriarchate and himself placed in his room; he bade defiance to Popes, and when they excommunicated him, to be even with them, he excommunicated them again; when they deposed him, he deposed them, and never was behind-hand with them in any kind offices; and this is thought to have been his greatest crime; though besides he held that a man has two souls,‡ while his enemies acted as if they thought men to have none. The Popes, it seems, had every one of them a touch at him in their turn, for he was condemned by nine Popes, and

* Lib. 1. tit. 9. c. 11.

† Vid. 2. Profess. fid. apud Garnerium, in Diurno.

‡ Bin. Not. ad Conc. 4. C. P. ex Possevin. Rader. &c. col. 1498, &c.

was under excommunication forty-five years,* which is somewhat longer, I think, than F. Widrington or F. Walsh. All this to be sure made him an abominable schismatic,† a fornicator, a parricide, a notorious liar, another Maximus Cynicus,‡ another Dioscorus, another Judas; Antichrist.§ To speak all in a word, he was a very devil.

5. After this heavy charge, what wickedness can be imagined that will not be believed of Photius? It is none of my business at present to make his defence, which would be now the more difficult to be done, because all the acts|| and writings for his justification were sought out and burnt in this fourth Council of C. P. It is sufficient for me to observe, that Pope Nicholas at first interposed as an indifferent arbitrator between him and Ignatius, which sure he would never have done, if Photius had been guilty of so notorious crimes: he was mainly concerned that himself had not been consulted; as for anything else it is not easy to observe which side he most inclined to. He writes to Photius and tells him, “he is glad to understand that he is orthodox, but is sorry he should from a laic immediately become a bishop, without passing through the inferior orders;” and this is the only exception against him. His legates so far approve Photius’s cause that they communicate with him, and condemn Ignatius; for which indeed they were excommunicated when they came home, because the Pope said they had gone beyond their commission, whether this were only a pretence, or that they had really exceeded their orders. In his epistles to the Emperor as well as to Photius, the Pope finds no other fault, but that of a laic he ought not to have been made Patriarch, though there had been so late an example of this in Tarasius, besides St. Ambrose and Nectarius. So that the plain truth is, Pope Nicholas would have the whole matter reserved to his own decision, and he should be the Patriarch whom Nicholas would appoint. To say that Photius usurped upon Ignatius is but a cavil,¶ for Ignatius had served John so before, as Anastasius confesses, and Nicholas does not deny it;** only he again urges, that himself ought to judge between them. In his epistle to Bardas he compliments him highly,†† telling him, “he was exceedingly troubled, that a man of his extraordinary character

* Conc. tom. 8. col. 1423.

† Ibid. col. 1108.

‡ Ibid. col. 1098.

§ Anastas. Præf. ibid. col. 967.

|| Vid. Can. 6, et col. 1101, 1130, 1354.

¶ Præf. ad Syn. 8. init.

** Nich. Ep. 5.

† Ep. 12.

for virtue and piety should be concerned for Photius ;” which sufficiently overthrows the slander, that the deposition of Ignatius was procured, because he would not approve the incest of Bardas, but excommunicated him for it. Pope Nicholas is not consistent with himself in the account he gives of the behaviour of his legates in this affair ; sometimes he writes, that they informed him that they were under restraint,* and were told of very hard usage designed them ; but this was only rumour. In another epistle he writes, that they had been bribed to communicate with Photius, and to depose Ignatius ; but that they both denied they had done any such thing, till at last Zacharias confessed that he had communicated with Photius, and had deposed Ignatius ; but not a syllable of any bribe mentioned. Rhadoaldus,† the other legate, stood out still, and would not confess, nor would by any means be persuaded to abide his trial, but fled for it, notwithstanding all the kind words and promises of fair dealing the Pope could give him ; though in the thirteenth epistle they are said both to confess the fact,‡ and afterwards Rhadoaldus flies. So little is there to be relied upon in the invectives against Photius. This is certain, not a bishop was suffered to sit in the Council called to depose him,§ till he had first subscribed a writing sent thither from the Pope, wherein they denounced anathema to Photius, and condemned his Councils, and owned those against him ; then it can be no wonder if they libel him in the most bitter manner, calling him by all the ill names they could think of, and treat him in such terms as could not become them to use, whatever he might deserve ; that nothing might be wanting to the keenness of their malice, they make lambics upon him, which Anastasius has taken care to translate, but the Greeks were ashamed of them, for their copy tells us they were ill verses, and so it has omitted them : but Anastasius had no such nice stomach ;|| he knew no distinction of good or bad, so they were but against Photius. At the end of the ninth action, the Greeks, it seems, were not so witty in their own malice ; but Anastasius has supplied that defect, and added some rhymes of his own. I mention this the rather for the honour and antiquity of this way of confutation, because a late author has turned all the Papists’ arguments, and all their rallery too, into rhyme. In conclusion, the

* Ep. 6.

† Col. 381.

† Epist. 7. col. 289. et 10. col. 355.

§ Act. 1, 2, 3.

|| Act. 7. in fin.

Fathers subscribe his deposition, not with ink, but with wine consecrated in the sacrament,* which is a surer sign of the hatred they bare to Photius than of their belief of transubstantiation; for what malice could transport men to so extravagant impiety, as to profane our Lord's own blood to such a use? What the proceedings of this Council were, may be sufficiently understood from this which has been but intimated out of it; and I need not refer to the account Photius gives, but to the acts themselves, to observe their heat and fury against him. He complains of great terror and violence used in the Synod,† and that certain ambassadors from the Saracens were received there, and took their places as Patriarchs of the East. And there is still extant an epistle of Elias patriarch of Jerusalem,‡ which confirms the truth of what Photius says in this matter. He makes frequent complaints in his epistles of the hardships and miseries which himself and his party endured, and declares how unwillingly he entered upon the Patriarchate; and professes, "that if it had been in his own power, he would sooner have chosen to die than to venture on so high and difficult a station, and was now ready to resign:" and he makes these complaints not to any friend at a distance from court, or who could be a stranger to his affairs, but to Bardas, the man who is said to have conspired with him to get Ignatius deposed; if that were true, what need could he have to make such pressing solicitations to one so deeply engaged in his interest? And how ridiculous would such protestations be? Could he be so forsaken of all modesty and common sense, as to tell the very man,§ who contrived the whole business with him, how great a force and reluctancy he had upon himself in consenting to be made Patriarch? Theophanes,|| his deacon and prothonotary, was put to the torture, that by any means he might be compelled to accuse Photius, which he afterwards lamented, and besought his pardon.

* Nicetas in vita Ignat. ap. Labbé, Conc. tom. 8.

† — *εἰ καὶ μέχρι νῦν οὐ τετόλμηται, οὐδ' ἔστιν ἔχειν παράδειγμα, Ἰσραηλιτῶν ἀξίων πρέσβεις καὶ ὑπερίτας εἰς ἀρχιερατικοὺς ἀνδρας μεταπλάσαι, καὶ πατριαρχὰ τούτοις προνόμια περιδεῖναι, καὶ τοῦ Σαυμασίου αὐτῶν συνεδρίου κορυφαίους ἀποφῆναι*, etc. Phot. Epist. 118. "And if hitherto they were not daring enough, yet it was an unexampled thing to change the ambassadors and servants of impious Saracens into high-priests, and to give them the precedency of Patriarchs, and to set them up as heads of their wonderful assembly."

‡ Philippi Cyprii Chron. Eccles. Græc. cum Com. Henr. Hilarii. p. 137.

§ Epist. 3 et 6.

|| Epist. 83.

Photius gives a large description of his miseries in an epistle which he wrote to the bishops while he was in banishment.* And all this he suffered for his loyalty to his prince;† for he was deposed because he refused to receive Basilios to communion after he had murdered Michael the Emperor. Whoever considers his unshaken loyalty, and reads his writings, will not easily believe that he could be so notorious a villain as he is represented; but if so much wickedness could meet in one man, in one bishop, yet how improbable is it that the whole Greek Church should respect and reverence this bishop as a saint? or that Pope John VIII., after his cause had been so narrowly examined, and his enemies had said and done their utmost, should yet think him a man of an orthodox faith and an unblameable life, and compare him to St. Athanasius, St. Cyril and St. Chrysostom? But he had discovered that his predecessors had been imposed upon, or that something more severe must be said of them; and so are all those imposed upon, or would impose upon others, who give us so monstrous a character of so excellent a man. He is charged with having corrupted the acts of the Councils which restored him, and particularly those passages which import that this fourth Council of C. P. was cancelled by that. But is it a sure proof of corruption and forgery if copies differ, as the Greek and Latin copies often do? The next question will be, where the forgery lies, and who is to be taxed with it. To go no farther, the version of Anastasius and the Greek original of this fourth Council of C. P., differ very much: for besides other variations there are twenty-seven canons in the Latin, and but fourteen in the Greek; yet both of them must pass for authentic enough, though the seventeenth of the additional canons will give the French some pains to reconcile it to the practice of their Church. For it appoints that all metropolitans shall meet in council at the summons of their Patriarch, notwithstanding any prohibition from the secular magistrate, and that princes should not be present in any but General Councils; both which are contrary to the practice of the French Church; for their princes are wont to be present in their national and provincial Synods, and their bishops, if they be detained by command from the King, think that a sufficient excuse for absenting themselves from any Synod their Patriarch shall call them to. Two eminent prelates of that Church, de Marca

* Epist. 174.

† Zonar. Annal. et Leo Grammat. Chronograph.

and Bosquet, have endeavoured to explain this canon so as to justify their own doctrine and practice; but Christianus Lupus was so little satisfied with the attempt, that he exclaims against it, as becoming rather Eusebius of Nicomedia, or Acacius of Cæsarea, then bishops of the Gallican Church; and whereas they allege the authority of Hincmar of Rheims, he plainly says, that they might as well have alleged Luther's testimony against the Council of Trent. Natalis Alexander interposes to mediate the business, and would willingly make up the debate, with what success let Lupus's party judge. But still these canons must be all acknowledged authentic, though they are not in the Greek; but if the Greek differ from the Latin in anything material that goes in the least against the Church of Rome, loud outcries are presently made of falsehood and forgery. For the charge here seems to lie not against Photius alone, but against all the Greeks in general, even from the second to the eighth General Council. So Anastasius complains,* that they had falsified the second, the third, the fourth, the sixth, the seventh General Councils, and he suspects that they might use the same fraud as to the eighth. Nay, they did so: the sly Greeks† stole away the subscriptions which they had made in the beginning of this Council, and though they restored them after they were discovered, yet at the end of the Council they had shewn them such another trick, if Anastasius had not been too cunning for them. They had already taken out some expressions which Adrian II. foisted into an epistle of his predecessor; and so they had robbed the Western Emperor of all the fine things which the present Pope had made his predecessor say of him; but Anastasius, who with another as cunning as himself, by great providence as it was thought, was there, found out the wrong done the Emperor, and great clamours were raised about it; nor would the legates at last subscribe otherwise than conditionally, "Usque ad voluntatem ejusdem eximii præsulis:"‡ "As far as it was the desire of that worthy prelate:" which may convince us what a noise has used to be made of forgery against the Greeks of whatever party, for Basilius and Ignatius, we see, are not exempted: the whole Greek Church of all ages is

* Pref. in Conc. C. P. 4. col. 972.

† Anastas. not. ad Action. 1. col. 989. Omne, quod ad laudem Sere-
nissimi nostri Cæsaris sanctissimus Dominus Hadrianus in Epistola sui
decessoris, Arsenio episcopo imminente, adjecerat, etc. Gulielmus quidam
alter Bibliothecarius continuator Anastasii in Adrian. II. p. 389.

‡ Anastasii Continuatur. in Adrian. II. p. 339.

accused of these fraudulent practices, which assures us that there have been such practices on one side ; and on which side the fraud lies may easily be determined, if we consider that the passages pretended to have been forged were received by all other Churches, and are not now denied to be genuine by the most learned men in the Church of Rome, as has been shewn. It is no new thing to hear of complaints of forgery, when anything goes against the Church of Rome, and Photius is not the first man that has been blackened to make the charge find a more easy belief.

6. Well ! but Photius has before been guilty of making alterations in an epistle of Pope Nicholas,* as that Pope complains. Very likely ! and that he might be sure not to be discovered, it was sent† back again falsified to the Pope with the acts of Photius's Council. This is such an odd kind of cheat, that it lays one thing to his charge, which his worst enemies never durst brand him with, and is so great an instance of folly, that it ruins all the rest of the characters they have been pleased to bestow upon him : for it is acknowledged on all hands, that he was peculiarly eminent for his learning, and for that which his enemies call subtlety, and his friends wisdom. That John VIII. did consent that Photius should be patriarch, is not denied, nor that he sent his legates with instructions for that purpose, as both his Epistles and his Commonitorium certify. So far no forgery is pretended ; but they say John never consented to the abrogating of the fourth Council of C. P. and that if the legates consented to any such thing, they went beyond their commission ; but they rather incline to think, that though the legates were guilty of too much connivance, and so betrayed the trust reposed in them, yet the acts of the Council that restored Photius are falsified, as the epistles of John VIII. are in all those passages which speak any thing in derogation to this fourth Council of C. P.

7. But, first, it is certain that the restoring of Photius ; and the owning him not only for a patriarch, but even for a bishop only, is so far a derogation to this Council, which fourth canon decrees, that Photius is no bishop, and pronounceth all his episcopal acts void ; so that the Council which afterwards, by the consent and approbation of John VIII., acknowledges Photius for a bishop and a patriarch too, does most certainly declare this whole canon null, and bids fair towards the jus-

* Epist. 6, et 10.

† Ibid.

tifying all that is pretended to be forged in John's Epistles. I cannot think the alterations in these epistles, by whomsoever they were made, are so ancient as Photius's time, perhaps they may be much later than Ivo Carnutensis; but if they be of so ancient date, and if it be true, that this Pope afterwards recalled his approbation, and renounced communion with Photius, and anathematized him and his own legates for no other reason, but because he was laughed at for a tame-man,* and in mockery called a woman Pope, Pope Joan instead of Pope John: if he was so weak and inconstant so soon to contradict his own Epistles and his Commonitorium (which are confessed to have been sent on purpose to restore Photius), for no other reason, but because he was upbraided with casting such a reflection upon his two predecessors Nicholas I. and Adrian II., the sworn enemies of Photius; he might then be willing to have his epistles so altered, as to make him most consistent with his predecessors, and with himself. But much more would he be inclined to be consenting to such an alteration, if there were other motives more forcible; for the truth is, Photius was the great champion for the liberties of the Greek Church, and therefore he must be sure to enjoy no favour from the Church of Rome, which began to be as angry with Ignatius, when he shewed himself in the same cause. For the first breach between the Greek and the Latin Churches was occasioned by contentions about jurisdiction, though afterwards it spread itself farther into other causes. Holstenius would not allow this to be the rise of the schism; but Pet. de Marca† defends himself against his objections, and maintains what he had before asserted, that no other cause could be assigned; Baluzius adds, that he might have said farther, that the Popes of Rome were in the fault, and could never justify their pretensions; which had been no more, says he, than our ancestors have said before, as he there shews by particular instances. We see that Pope John's Epistles are as fully for abrogating this Council in Ivo Carnutensis, as Photius could make them, though he had endeavoured it never so much; and for my part, I cannot believe that Photius was so much concerned for the Pope's approbation, as that he would be at the pains to falsify the acts of a Council upon that account: he had

* Bin. Not. in vit. Joh. Octavi, et Andr. Schot. Præf. ad Photii Bibliothecam.

† Concord. Imp. et Sacerd. lib. 1. §. 4. cum Baluz observ. et Prolegom. p. 15.

excommunicated and deposed Pope Nicholas ;* and though he was himself afterwards deposed, yet was he restored without the Pope's leave or knowledge, only the Pope had some hopes of having his pretensions to Bulgaria succeed, and upon that sent to ratify what they could not hinder ;† but when he found himself mistaken in his design, and Photius the same man still, he fell foul upon him, as his predecessors had done. Now cannot I be persuaded that Photius, if he could be so base and wicked as to make a thousand forgeries, would yet do it here ; when he could not hope to be undiscovered, or would condescend to use such vile and foolish arts, only to countenance his proceedings with the appearance of that authority, which he had in so much scorn and defiance. This would be, as if Archbishop Cranmer, after he had renounced the Pope's supremacy, should have falsified the bulls, which the Pope dispatched hitherto for his promotion to the See of Canterbury. The Greeks, we have seen, looked upon this as the healing synod, which, after the death of Ignatius, had reconciled all differences amongst them, by making void the Council held against Photius, and settling him in his see again, and therefore whatever heats had passed between Ignatius and Photius (as it often happens between very good men, and had happened between their own St. Chrysostom and Epiphanius), yet now these things being composed into a happy peace and settlement, notwithstanding the Pope's anathema, they received the names of both Photius and Ignatius into their diptychs, and registered them amongst their saints, whom they most solemnly commemorate in their prayers.

8. There are so many improbabilities in the story against Photius, that they will hardly gain belief without a miracle ; and therefore we are told, that in the Council held against him at Rome, under Adrian II. when the book which contained his vindication, after it had been trampled upon by all the reverend assembly, was at last thrown by his Holiness into the fire ; the flames caught at it, and devoured it immediately in a strange manner, with a noisome smell, and a kind of pitch colour tinctured the fire ; and besides, a great shower happening at the same time increased the flames, as if so much oil had been thrown upon them. And now who is so hardy as to deny the authority of any thing that was said or done against Photius, or to doubt that the fourth Council

* Anast. Præfat. col. 967.

† Bin. ex Baronio, Conc. tom. 9. col. 326.

of C. P. is in full force, and infallibly the eighth General Council?

§. VIII. The imperfect account we have of the three first Lateran Councils serves only to shew the little esteem which was formerly had of them* how general or infallible soever they might be; Bellarmine confesses, that the two first are not extant; and no great discoveries have been made of them since his time: Caranza and Silvius mention none of the three; and at the end of the fourth Lateran Council, Caranza puts *Explicit Concilium Lateranense primum*. Platina passes them all over, without bestowing so much as the title of General upon them; and with so little remark, as shews that he esteemed them none of the most considerable actions of those Popes' lives who called them. Indeed there are few provincial Synods the records whereof less care has been taken of; nor could it be that any Council should universally obtain amidst so much faction and schism, and among so many anti-popes as then vexed and divided the Church.† But it was the custom of those times to call all Councils General, which made any tolerable settlement of the Popedom, with the approbation of some of the chief western princes. Thus William of Tyre, speaking of the third Council of Lateran,‡ *Cum anno præcedente indicta esset per universum Latinorum orbem Romæ Synodus Generalis, ad eandem Synodum vocati profecti sunt de nostro oriente, &c.* "When there was a General Synod called at Rome the foregoing year, throughout all the Latin world, those who were called went out of the east," &c. He mentions no more out of the east but himself and three other bishops, with one prior and one abbot; and he, as most think, was a Latin; and so it is probable were all the rest: however, the Greeks in this Council opposed the Latins, and would not yield in the least. But not only Western Councils, but national and provincial Synods were sometimes styled General; and Sir Roger Twisden§ gives many instances to shew, that the distinction of General Councils, at least in that sense in which it

* The first Later. Council, A.D. 1123. [Labbé, Concil. vol. 10. p. 891, ut supra.] The second Lat. Council, A.D. 1139. [Conc. vol. 10. p. 999, ut supra.] The third Lat. Council, A.D. 1180 or 1179, secundum Lab. [Lab. Concil. vol. 10. p. 1503, ut supra.]

† Platina in Calixto Secundo. Innoc. Secundo. Alexan. Tertio.

‡ Bell. Sacr. lib. 21. c. 26.

§ Historic Vindic. cap. 8. p. 162. Eodem anno 1222. Magister Stephanus de Langetuna Generale Concilium celebravit apud Oxonium. Hist. Maj. ad annum 1222.

is now taken, was not suddenly brought into the Church, many Synods by our writers being called General, to which the obligation was never of that nature, as if they did not or could not err: and the same learned author proves, that the Lateran Council under Innocent II. was never received in England.* Thus Matt. Paris says, that Stephen Langton held a General Council at Oxford; yet the name of General, bestowed upon them by some well disposed to that Pope's interest who called them, is almost all that can be shewn for the authority of these three Councils. It doth not appear that any of the Eastern bishops were in the two first, and it is certain that the Greeks dissented in the third, as they ever did, when they had no restraint upon them. It is remarkable, that in this Council an oath was drawn up, by which all the bishops that had rejected Alexander III. abjured, and swore allegiance to him against all men, *contra omnem hominem*; which oath was afterwards improved into that which all bishops, &c. take at their consecration.†

§. IX. 1. The fourth Council of Lateran, under Innocent III. A.D. 1215, is reckoned the twelfth General Council in order by Bellarmine, Possevin, &c.‡ Cardinal Pole, with his Synod at Lambeth, owns it for General; they frequently mention it, and never but under the title of General; though they do not put it in the same rank among the General Councils, they profess however to receive and embrace the faith of the Church of Rome according to the decrees of the General Council of Lateran under Innocent III.§ The Council of Constance requires all Popes to make profession of the faith established in the eight sacred General Councils, whereof this is set down for one;|| and the Council of Trent itself calls this a General Council,¶ the great General Council of Lateran,** and makes use of its authority again;†† and, which is yet more to the purpose, a Council of English bishops held at Oxford,‡‡ not above seven years after, acknowledge the authority of this Council of Lateran, and several times quote its decrees. In short, as this is placed by Bellarmine among those Councils, which are received with full approbation beyond all dispute by

* P. 167.

† Labbé, Conc. et Pontificale Rom.

‡ The fourth Lat. Council, 1215. [Lab. Concil. vol. 11. p. 117, ut supra.]

§ Decret. 2.

|| Session 39.

¶ Session 24. cap. 5.

** Session 14. cap. 5.

†† Session 21. cap. 9.

‡‡ Conc. tom. 11. part 1. A.D. 1222. cap. 24, 28, 29, 33.

VOL. XV.

the Church of Rome; so he looks upon it as no less than heresy to deny the authority of it; and therefore when he has produced the third canon of this Council in defence of the deposing doctrine against Barclay, he cries out with great zeal and vehemence, *Quid hic Barclaius diceret? si hæc non est Ecclesiæ Catholicæ vox, ubi obsecro eam inveniemus? et, si est (ut verissime est), qui eam audire contemnit, ut Barclaius fecit, annon ut ethnicus et publicanus, et nullo modo Christianus et pius habendus erit?* "What can Barclay say to this? if this be not the voice of the Catholic Church, where I pray shall we find it? and if it is) as questionless it is) he that despises to hear it (as Barclay has done), is he not to be looked upon as an heathen man and a publican, and by no means a Christian or a pious man?" This Widrington complains of as intolerably insulting;* others may rather think he speaks as a Cardinal, when he was managing the Pope's cause so victoriously from so infallible evidence. For such is the authority and esteem in the Church of Rome of this Council, that it is usually called the Great Council of Lateran, either from the great number of bishops in it, or from the great importance of the matters decided, or both. The number of bishops was no less than four hundred and twelve, or in Bellarmine's reckoning four hundred and seventy-three; and among these were the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and the delegates of the other two Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, seventy-seven Primates and Metropolitans, besides eight hundred Abbots and Priors: these were all there in person, and proxies were sent innumerable. The Emperor likewise of Constantinople, the King of Sicily, Emperor of the Romans elect, the Kings of England, France, Hungary, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Arragon, and other princes and cities sent their ambassadors hither; so that never was there such a show perhaps in the world again.

2. The matters determined both of faith and discipline, were extraordinary, and of the greatest importance. The doctrines of faith defined were transubstantiation,† the articles concerning the Holy Trinity asserted and vindicated from the error of Abbot Joachim, and those errors condemned, and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son declared.‡ The deposing doctrine established.§ The Church of Rome

* Discussio Discuss. part 1. §. 2. p. 28.

† Cap. 1.

‡ Cap. 2.

§ Cap. 3.

declared to be the mother and mistress of all Christians (*universorum Christi fidelium*), and to have, by God's appointment, the dominion over all other churches of ordinary authority by her extraordinary prerogative.*

3. The decrees in points of discipline are in their kind no less considerable; against the incontinency of the clergy,† against their drunkenness,‡ against the negligence and debauchery of prelates,§ that no clergyman should give sentence in capital causes.|| Auricular confession enjoined once every year:¶ that no clergyman should take an oath of allegiance to any secular persons, unless he held some temporal estate of them:** that no clergyman should be obliged to pay taxes:†† the manner of proceedings in excommunications regulated:‡‡ the prohibition of marriages restrained to the fourth degree:§§ clandestine marriages forbidden, and the children of parents married within the degrees prohibited, declared illegitimate:|||| against simony,¶¶ and many other things of like nature, which are of the highest consequence, and fall under daily practice.

4. All this, one would think, were sufficient to put the authority of the fourth Council of Lateran beyond all contradiction or debate; for who can imagine that a Council celebrated with so much solemnity, which decided controversies of so mighty concernment in the Church, and determined things of continual use among all sorts and orders of men, should not immediately meet with the most entire submission, and always retain an undoubted authority and veneration. Thus much would have been due, if it had not been infallible; but being infallible, what regard must every age, and every nation, and every writer, at least every traditional Christian pay to it! Yet this very Council, so famous and so renowned in its members, so extraordinary in its determinations and decrees, lay dormant, unregarded and unknown till the year 1537, that is, till above three hundred years after it was held. It is very surprising that neither Innocent himself, nor his nephew and next successor but one, Gregory IX. who published his uncle's Decretal Epistles, and these very decrees, which now pass for the decrees of this Council among the rest, should put this forth among the other General Councils; it is strange that no other Pope or bishop,* or at least some canonist, or other learned man, should ever think of it; but it is yet

* Cap. 5.

† Cap. 14.

‡ Cap. 15.

§ Cap. 17.

|| Cap. 18.

¶ Cap. 21.

** Cap. 43.

†† Cap. 46.

‡‡ Cap. 47.

§§ Cap. 50.

|||| Cap. 51.

¶¶ Cap. 63.

more strange, that Merlin, in his Councils, printed but three years before the fourth Council of Lateran was published, should omit this, though he sets down the Councils of Constance and Basil. But when this Council did come to light, with what credentials did it come? What evidence does it bring for its authority? Is it printed from some ancient manuscripts in the Vatican? It might then be wondered how it should lie so long concealed, never published, never quoted, nor mentioned; but it is a much greater wonder, how the Pope's own library, so famed for manuscripts, should miss of this, where so much of Popery, and the principal and nicest part of it, his own prerogative, is concerned. Would the Popes of Rome keep no authentic records in a thing of this nature, which so nearly touches them? They are not used to be so careless in these matters: the other Patriarchs, as Cossartius would persuade us, had all of them copies, and the decrees were turned into Greek for that very purpose: how came the Pope himself then to have none, or where had the copies of the other Patriarchs lain so many hundred years hid? It was perhaps from one of those copies, that we have now the decrees of this Council: no such matter; but Johannes Cochläus, a German, one of Luther's adversaries, produces them after above three hundred years' concealment, and about twenty years after the reformation begun by Luther, out of some obscure manuscripts, and sends them to Peter Crabbe to be annexed to his Councils; and what was wanting in that, has been picked up here and there, and pieced together since.

5. But first there are no subscriptions to this Council, and then Matt. Paris,* who lived at that time, says that sixty *Capitula* were proposed, which some liked, others thought burthensome. He mentions but sixty *Capitula*; but in the Council as we now have it, are seventy, and in Innocent's works seventy-two. Matt Paris in plain terms says,† that this Council ended in laughter and mockery; that the Pope got a good sum of money from the Fathers before he would let them part; and that they were forced to borrow the money, and make present payment, before he would give them leave to be gone; and that then the gainful synod was dissolved, and the clergy went with heavy hearts away. Some have

* In Johanne, 1215.

† Papa, jam accepta pecunia, quæstuosum hoc Concilium dissolvit gratis, totusque Clerus abiit tristis (Hist. Min. apud Antiquit. Britannic. in vit. Steph. Langton. p. 158. Edit. Hanov.)

excepted against the testimony of Matt. Paris,* but without reason; for Innocent IV. gives him this character, that "he was a man of known virtue and piety;" and indeed he is observed to be so impartial an historian, that it is his manner to relate the plain truth of things, whoever may suffer by it, not sparing so much as Henry III. at whose command he wrote his history, nor the very monks of his own order. The Archbishop of Spalato, upon citing Matt. Paris on this occasion, says, that he knew very well how the poor monk would be exclaimed against as a schismatic, a liar, and an enemy to the apostolic see, whatever were alleged in his defence. "For it is an usual thing for us Romanists," adds he, "to lay aside grave authors, with the unjust reproach of heresy and schism, when they contradict our vain devices."† Godefridus,‡ another historian of the same age, agrees with Matt. Paris, that nothing was concluded in the Council; only he observes, indeed, that the Eastern church (a thing, he says, never heard of before), submitted itself to the See of Rome. Platina says the same thing, that nothing was decreed in this Council; but that it broke up of a sudden, and that the Pope going to reconcile the Pisans and Genoese, who were then at war by sea, and the Cisalpines by land, died at Perugia. Some would understand Platina so, as if he meant only that nothing was done towards the expedition into the Holy Land: but this can be none of his meaning, because in the last of those decrees we now have, this whole business is fully concluded upon and determined, which Platina could not have been ignorant of if there had been any such canons then, or if they had passed for genuine. Naucerus, in the words of Platina, says, many things were debated, but nothing concluded; but that however some Constitutions are said to have been published, one whereof, says he, is extant, importing, "that if one prince offend against another, the correction of him belongs to the Pope;" so it seems it was only report in his time, at the latter end of the fifteenth century, that ever any such decrees were published; and he knew of but one then extant, which yet is not to be found in this Council as we have it, nor in Innocent's Decretals, though these are the only canons that then could make any pretence to the authority of the Council. The preface to Innocent's works informs us, that these decrees

* Vir probatæ vitæ et Religionis expertæ. Vid. Matt. Paris ad An. 1248.

† Anton. de Dominis, lib 6. c. 10. p. 815. ‡ Annales ad An. 1215

were written by Innocent himself, and so are his, not the Council's Constitutions; if they were read in Council, that is the most that can be granted, and then they seemed to some easy or pleasing, to others burthensome: but if they were rather made after the Council was dissolved, because mention is frequently made of the Council as past, in them, then they must be written by that Pope in haste on his journey, or in the hurry of other business; for he went to make up a peace between the Pisans and the Genoese, and other Italians, but died before he could effect it at Perugia. The editor of his works, printed by Cholinus,* gathers from several places, that Innocent himself drew them up into this form which we have them now in, after the dissolution of the Council: he might have added many others† (as they are set down in the Council, but they are differently numbered in the Decretals), for the Council is quoted in all of them: but these quotations Cossartius refers to the Lateran Council under Alexander III., though it is not probable that that Council should be quoted at large under the name of the General Council of the Lateran without some particular distinction, either of the Pope's name under whom it is called, or of the third Lateran Council; for this is the usual way in citations, and had been necessary here to distinguish it from the other two Lateran Councils; but if we suppose these canons drawn up by Innocent III. after the dissolution of the Council, there could be no need of particularizing the Council which had been so lately held by himself; and he could be reasonably understood to mean no other than his own Council, unless he had specified it. But farther yet, Gregory IX.‡ though he have transcribed all the seventy *Capitula* into the Decretals, yet ascribes not one of them to the Council, but to Innocent himself only; *Innocentius Tertius in Concilio Generali*, though he often mentions the decrees made in the Lateran Council under Innocent III. as the decrees of the Council, taking no notice of Alexander. Platina likewise attributes the condemning the errors of Abbot Joachim and Almaris, not to the Council, but to Innocent.

6. Notwithstanding all this, the great Cardinal Perron§ pronounces roundly, that those who denied the authority of this Council deserve to be pitied rather than answered, perhaps because he found pitying more easy than answering; but

* Cap. 29, 33, 41.

† Cap. 11, 61, 65, 42, 46, 48.

‡ Widrington, *Discuss. Discuss. part. 1. §. 1. p. 10.*

§ *Ibid. p. 11, 12.*

he gives this very good reason for what he says, "because at this rate the preface concerning auricular confession would not be valid, nor transubstantiation *de fide*, no, nor the confession," nor the opposite articles to the errors of Joachim, and so the schoolmen in their writings, and the inquisitors in punishing heretics, had been all to blame. Widrington replies, that the practice of the Church, and the inserting these canons into the body of the canon law by Gregory IX. was sufficient to give authority to them. But this is to bring us back again from a Council to a Pope, and from him to send us to the Church diffusive, to inquire into her faith and practice; and so we are disappointed of the vast hopes conceived from so numerous an assembly. But if these things had then been of known practice and undoubted truth, how came they not immediately to be consented to in Council? how came they to seem grievous and burthensome to the bishops there? was not transubstantiation one of those grievances, the deposing doctrine another, auricular confession a third; and might not many more grievances be mentioned? Well, but the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the true notion of the Trinity must be called in question if we reject this Council: by no means, because this had been explained in other Councils as far as was necessary, and the Greek and Latin manuscripts of Cossartius leave out the procession; so that this was, it seems, but in some copies, and cannot be proved from this Council. But all these doctrines (says Widrington)* have been received and embraced by the catholic Church, and from thence derive their authority. This we deny; neither the deposing doctrine (as Widrington himself confesses and maintains), nor transubstantiation, nor auricular confession, was ever received by the catholic Church. But the truth is, he was forced to say something; he was loth to deny the authority of a Council now generally received by the Church of Rome, he rather chose to evade the third canon as well as he could, nor durst he, either in his answer to Lessius,† or in his last rejoinder to Fitzherbert,‡ disown the Council; but after he has raised all the objections he was able, professes at last, that as for his own part he receives it. The same objections have been lately renewed by Father Walsh, yet still he too does not profess to disown the authority of the Council.

7. But Cossartius produceth a Greek translation of this

* Ibid. p. 12.

† Discuss. ib. p. 22.

‡ Rejoinder, c. 9.

Council, which, he says, is of the same antiquity with the Council itself, and he is positive that the very sight of this is enough to convince all men the decrees are genuine; this translation shewing the agreement between the Greeks and the Latins; for that the decrees, which were made by the unanimous consent of all, might be by all observed, they were turned into the Greek language for the use and benefit of those who did not understand the Latin. The Greek, he confesses, is in many places barbarous, and his manuscripts in some places imperfect, and therefore in those places he was forced to give us only the Latin, leaving void spaces in the opposite column, where the Greek was defective: but here I observe, that the whole first chapter is not extant in the Greek copy; nor does it appear by any vacancies left in the print, that the manuscript was imperfect, but that the whole chapter was omitted by the Greek translator; and so if this manuscript prove any thing, it proves that the Greek Church did not concur with the Latin in the article of transubstantiation; for this being the first time that ever that doctrine was asserted in a General Council, certainly the Greeks would never have omitted to translate so material a passage of the Council, wherein this is contained, if they had agreed to it. All that part of the third chapter which concerns the deposing doctrine, is likewise wanting in the Greek; but here he tells us is a leaf of the manuscript wanting both in the Greek and the Latin: it were to be wished we could know how it came to be wanting; but, however, this serves to confirm to us, that nothing is deficient in the first chapter, but that the manuscript is entire, though the whole chapter be only in Latin; and so the doctrine of transubstantiation had the ill-luck to be left out in the translation of the first Council in which it ever was defined; for which no other reason can be given, if this manuscript be authentic, but that the major part of the Church, *i. e.* all the East, and four Patriarchs of five, rejected it. The translator often mistakes the Latin, and quite alters the sense: and in the second chapter, where the catholic doctrine concerning the blessed Trinity is explained, the particle *non* is omitted in the Latin and *οὐκ* in the Greek; a small mistake in a matter of faith; but such a mistake as could not easily escape in both languages, or, if it did, must needs give a very exact and faithful account of what was defined in the Council. This and other gross faults do not make much for the credit of this manuscript, nor engage us

necessarily to believe, upon its sole authority, that the Greek Church received the fourth Lateran Council, or indeed, that it was ever received at all till of late years: which many learned men in the Church of Rome have been so sensible of, that they have never alleged its authority but when they had nothing else to allege. For neither the more ancient of our modern divines, says Widrington,* who are vehement maintainers of the Pope's power to depose princes, as Victoria, Corduba, Sanders, and others, nor Cardinal Bellarmine himself, in his controversies, did make any great reckoning of the decree of this great Council. This was Bellarmine's last refuge, when he was beaten off from his other arguments by Barclay; and though he urges it with great confidence and earnestness, yet if he had much relied upon its authority, he would have used it before; for if the Council be general, the argument is unanswerable and infallible in their account, whatever disguises may be put upon it. The opposers of this Lateran Council further add,† that the Council of Constance meant not this Council, but that of Lateran under Alexander III.; and that the Council of Trent spoke according to the common opinion, that is, in plain terms, the Council of Trent was mistaken, and that in a matter of no small consequence; for if one General Council tell the world that another is general which is really not so; what assurance can men have of any Council that it is general? or what errors may not a General Council by this means lead men into? What they answer to the testimony of the Council held at Oxford so soon after, I am yet to learn; but it can be no wonder that our clergy should at that time yield to any thing the Pope desired, when the Archbishop of Canterbury had had so fresh an instance of his power, who had been suspended in this very Council of Lateran, and was willing to comply with any thing that might advance his interest at Rome. The Pope openly styled King John his vassal, and had reduced all Christendom to such dependence and obedience, that there was not one of those secular princes, and states that gave their attendance at this Council, but were some way or other obnoxious to him, and stood in awe of him; the Crusade left the Popes at liberty to play their own game at home; and had gained them more in the East than could ever be gotten by all the Councils that were ever called. Henry, brother to Baldwin, earl of Flanders, was then possessed of Constantinople,

* Last Rejoinder, c. 9.

† Widrington, ib. p. 20.

with the title and honour of Greek Emperor, and the four eastern Patriarchs were all western bishops, one Frenchman and three Italians, who held their patriarchates of the Pope, and were never owned in their respective titular sees. Upon this account it is rather strange, that any demur should be made to this Pope's dictates in Council, or that this Council should not be every where revered as an oracle, than that one nation, which had smarted so much under the Pope's displeasure, should acknowledge it in his successor's days ; for Honorius III. was no degenerate successor to Innocent III. and our nation then had learned to submit to harder terms than these ; yet sure there must be something in these decrees very irksome, which could not pass the votes of an assembly so entirely addicted to the Pope ; and here is no mention of the doctrines of the Lateran Council in that of Oxford ; besides, it is remarkable that Richard, bishop of Salisbury, A.D. 1217, two years after the Council, cites it, c. 7, yet c. 4, where he gives an exposition of the Catholic faith, does not follow this Council in putting down transubstantiation for one article of it. And Sir Roger Twisden shews,* that notwithstanding this Council of Oxford, the fourth Council of Lateran was not received in England. Not to dissemble any thing material in this business, Matt. Paris himself relates,† that the Archdeacon of St. Albans quotes the twenty-first canon as a canon of this Council, and so Innocent IV. calls it ; but Alexander IV. takes not the least notice of this canon, when he reverses Innocent's decree in favour of the monks, giving them liberty to hear confessions without the consent of the parish priests ; nor do his cardinals, when he advised with them upon this occasion,‡ in the instrument which they drew up about that controversy, make mention of any canon of a General Council in favour of the parish priests. But whether it were that it could not be easily believed, that so many men should meet together to no purpose, or that Innocent's decrees in the Lateran Council were mistaken for the decrees of the Council itself ; or whether Innocent IV. having called it a General Council, it was thought no good manners to contradict him ; however it were, in process of time the canons were owned as genuine, and some of them more early than one would expect, as may be seen particularly of the twenty-first canon, *Omnis utriusque sexus*, &c.

* Historical Vindication, c. 8. p. 165.

† Ad Annum 1246.

‡ Launoii explicat. Tradit. Eccles. circa Canon. utriusque sexus.

Yet, after all, a late doctor of the Sorbonne, with the approbation of the faculty, has concluded from the foregoing arguments,* that no canons were made by the Council, but that some decrees only, being framed by the Pope, and read in Council, some of them, to the major part, seemed burthensome.

§. X. 1. Launoy proves against Bellarmine,† that the first Council of Lyons under Innocent IV. was not general, because Innocent, in his sentence against Frederick, though he often mentions the Council, yet never calls it general, or universal, or œcumenical; and so in his epistles to the Archbishop of Sens, and to the chapter of that church, to the bishops of England, and to the bishop of Ostia, he never so much as once calls it General; which certainly he would have done, if he could have ascribed to it so great authority: but he called thither only the king of France, the archbishop of Sens and his chapter, besides the bishops of England and the bishop of Ostia. The bishops of Italy, Sicily, Germany, Arragon, Castile, and Portugal, it doth not appear that he ever called: for Odoricus Rainaldus, in his continuation of Baronius, gives a register of the epistles which Innocent wrote upon this account, but mentions none sent to any of these bishops. I omit, says Launoy, the Eastern bishops, *Qui profecto vocati non fuere*, who assuredly were not called. He shews, that Bellarmine contradicts himself in this matter, and goes against his own principles, tacitly retracting, in his eighteenth chapter, *de Concil.* lib. 1. what he had said in his fifth of this Council; and besides, does abuse Palmerius and Platina, whose authority he brings to prove it General, whereas neither of them say any such thing. And thus, says he, has Bellarmine run himself into such difficulties, as he will never be able to get clear of: for if the conditions required by him to make a Council General be true, then is this not general; if this be general, then are not those conditions rightly laid down, nor the business truly stated. But as for Palmerius and Platina, who are falsely quoted, he can never bring himself off unless he pretends negligence, which indeed makes the case but so much the worse.

2. This Council of Lyons is not in Nicolin's Councils, printed at Venice, 1585, with the approbation of Sixtus V. under this title, "*Conciliorum omnium, tam Generalium quam Provincialium, quæ jam inde ab Apostolicis temporibus hactenus*

* Du Pin. Dissert. p. 573.

† Ep. part 7. ad Raymundum Formentinum, p. 228, &c.

legitime celebrata haberi potuerunt." Caranza likewise and Sylvius either knew nothing of it, or thought it not worth their taking notice of.

3. But it is more considerable,* that in the late contest between the Pope and the King of France, the Court of Rome contending, that the Regale are only concessions of the Church, which were restrained in the Council of Lyons, and that therefore they ought not to be extended to churches which were not then subject to the French; the Archbishop of Rheims, in an assembly at Paris of twenty-six bishops, and six that were named to bishoprics, being chief of the committee of six deputed to consider the affair of the Regale, and make report, declares, that the Council of Lyons was so little considered, that in the famous contest between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. the King founded his pretensions on the practice of St. Louis, and not on the decree of that Council. However, this Council was general enough to depose the Emperor Frederick II., and to be appealed to as a sufficient warrant for the deposing of emperors ever since. But the English could not get justice done them upon Martin, the Pope's legate, though they often and earnestly demanded it in the name of the whole nation: they remonstrated several times, and made divers and repeated complaints of the great extortions that had been made upon them; but were sent away without redress: they complained, that there was an infinite number of Italians in England, who exhausted all the revenues of the Church, but performed nothing at all of the duties required; that besides subsidies and other ways, the bare revenue, paid yearly out of this kingdom to Italians, amounted to above threescore thousand marks, which was more than the king's revenue. But all they could say availed nothing: this General Council† was called for deposing kings, not for redressing grievances; and for the glory of Popes, and the terror of all succeeding emperors. To explain the story of this Council, Sixtus Quintus placed the following inscription in the Vatican;‡ "*Innocentio Quarto, Pont. Max. Imp. Fredericus Secundus, hostis Ecclesie declaratur, imperioque privatur*; Frederick II. Emperor, is declared an enemy to the Church, and deprived of his empire by Innocent IV. Pope." And while the Emperor was thus

* Burnet's History of the Rights of Princes, &c. p. 309.

† Con. tom. 2. part. 1.

‡ Angelus Roccha, Bibliothec. Vatican. p. 208.

depressed, the same Council advanced the cardinals, and set them on horseback in red hats and purple robes.

§. XI. The history of the second Council of Lyons* is in short thus; Michael Paleologus,† after he had put out the eyes of the young Emperor Johannes Lascaris, whose guardian he was, and was excommunicated by Arsenius the patriarch, and by this means became odious to all mankind, and was in imminent danger from Charles, king of Sicily, who was preparing to recover C. P. lately regained by Michael. Michael being in these circumstances bethought himself of reconciling the two Churches, as a proper expedient to settle himself in his new-gotten dominions: but his Patriarch Joseph was utterly averse to any such proposal, and had engaged himself by an oath never to agree to any union with the Latin Church upon the terms insisted on; him therefore Michael forces to resign, and hide himself in a monastery, but upon condition of resuming his place again, if this business could not be effected with the Latins:‡ the rest of the clergy§ he proceeds|| with in a powerful way of conviction, by punishment, imprisonment, and torments. Beccus the Chartophylax, a man of a ready wit and a fluent tongue,¶ not without much difficulty and hard usage, is at last in prison persuaded to apply himself to the study of certain books very edifying for the purpose, and so is converted to the Emperor's party, and argues the point against all opposers. In the meantime Theophanes,** bishop of Nice, and Germanus, once patriarch of C. P. a known favourite of the Emperor's, with three of the principal officers at court are sent to Lyons, where in a short time all is concluded with Gregory X.†† and the Pope's utmost desire fulfilled; and Beccus is made patriarch for his pains as soon as they came home. But at their return these men were the common object of hatred to their countrymen;‡‡ and whatever promises and protestations they had made in the Council, they soon forgot them all; whereupon Pope Martin excommunicates Michael, who was most of all detested on both sides;

* The second Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274.

† Pachymeres *Fragm. a Dionys. Petavio. edit. p. 330.*

‡ Pachym. p. 335.

§ Bonorum, videlicet, Publicationibus, Relegationibus, Carceribus, Excommunicationibus, Plagis, Mutilationibus, et id genus aliis Pænis. Angelus Roc. Biblioth. Vatican. ex Niceph. Greg. lib. 5.—in teterrimos carceres connectus fuit (Beccus) ib. ex eod.

|| P. 345, 347.

¶ P. 329.

** Ib. p. 334.

†† Ib. p. 357.

‡‡ Con. tom. 2. part. 1. p. 996.

and after about seven years spent in a troublesome reign, died unlamented, and was not allowed the most ordinary rites of burial by his own son.*

§. XII. After a vacancy of the Popedom* for about eleven months, Philip the Fair had procured Clement V. to be chosen Pope, but did before oblige him by oath to certain conditions, which, being drawn up under six heads, were agreed upon and sworn to; one of which was to absolve Philip from the censures of his predecessor Boniface VIII. another, that he should brand the memory of Boniface with anathema for the crimes charged upon him, which were no less than heresy, schism, and perjury. The first Clement readily performed, but stuck at the second; and at once, both to avoid the odium of the thing, and to put a better colour on those crimes in himself, which he was required to condemn in Boniface, he was advised to call a Council. He did so at Vienna, in which he found an easy expedient to acquit Boniface from the crimes objected, and himself from the performance of his oath. This was the ground† and occasion of the calling this Council. But since they were met, the better, it is likely, to amuse the King, and that their only business might not appear to be to delude him, they proceed to condemn the Biguardi and Beguinæ, and certain heretics of those times; and for the abominable enormities‡ committed by the Knights Templars, they dissolve that order, and settle their endowments upon the Knights Hospitallers of Jerusalem. The feast of Corpus Christi was likewise in this Council confirmed, and the procession on that day instituted, and the study of the Eastern languages encouraged. As for the Clementine Constitutions,§ most of them were made before or after the Council, and published by Clement's successor John XXII. But one constitution|| had been worth at least four books of the five, viz. "*ut primæ sedis Episcopus princeps Sacerdotum, vel universalis Ecclesiæ non appelletur*"; that the bishop of the principal Church should not be called Prince of the Priests, or of the universal Church;" as it had been formerly determined in a Council at Carthage, and was now proposed, among other particulars, to

* Council of Vienne, A.D. 1311.

† Vercerius de rebus gestis Hen. Septimi, p. 4. citatus a Binio, in notis ad Concilium.

‡ Conc. tom. 2. part. 2.

§ Proœm. ad Clement. Constitut.

|| Conc. Afric. Art. 6.

this Council, by Durandus, in a treatise* concerning the manner of holding General Councils, published by him at the command of Clement V. and presented to the Council. But Clement in his Constitutions is so far from any such design, that he has not so much as revoked the decision of Pope Boniface VIII. in the bull *Unam sanctam*, where he determines it to be a point accessory to salvation, that every human creature submit itself to the Bishop of Rome; though indeed he did revoke it as to its exercise in the kingdom of France, by declaring, that the privileges of the Gallican Church were in no ways infringed by it. *Inter Extravag. cap. Meruit. tit. de Privilegiis*. The observation of Walter de Hemingford, who lived not long after, is considerable; "It did not deserve (says he) to be called a Council, because the Pope did all of his own head, without the consent or answer of the sacred Council."†

§. XIII. 1. Before we proceed to the Council of Florence, it will be necessary to consider a little the Councils of Constance and Basil,‡ which Bellarmine reckons amongst the Councils that are in part only approved, and that part of them which is not approved, is contradicted by the Florentine Council, the great controversy being, whether the Pope or a Council be superior. The Councils of Constance and Basil have determined in favour of Councils, and the Council of Florence and fifth Council of Lateran in favour of Popes.

2. To appease the schism between the contending Popes, a Council§ met at Pisa, from whence it was removed to Constance; and of the several Popes, John XXIII. confirms the acts of the Council, and submits himself to its determination, and so is deposed; Gregory XII. resigns his pretensions to the popedom; Benedict XIII. is disclaimed by most of his own abettors, and deprived in Council. Martin V. who had been present all along both at Pisa and at Constance, is chosen, and by his bull confirmed all that had passed, as he was

* Tit. 34. p. 130.

† Quod Concilium dici non merebatur, quia ex capite proprio omnia fecit Dominus Papa, non respondente, neque consentiente sacro Concilio. apud Twisden, Historical Vindication, cap. 8. p. 164. ex MSS. A great part of this Walter de Hemingford's works, all his Chronicon, which goes down to Henry the Third's death, were printed this year at Oxford, and we are promised the rest soon.

‡ Council of Constance, A.D. 1414.

§ The first Council of Pisa, A.D. 1409.

concerned to do,* the validity of his own consecration depending upon the validity of the Council's decrees. The Council determines,* "That, the synod gathered together in the Holy Ghost, lawfully making a General Council, representing the catholic Church militant, has power immediately from Christ, to which every one, of whatsoever state or dignity (even the Pope) is bound to obey, in those things which belong to the faith, and the extirpation of the aforesaid schism, and the general reformation of the Church in its head and members," &c. It obliges† all succeeding Popes for ever to call a Council once in ten years, ordaining that the next immediate Council should be called at the end of five years, and another seven years after, "*Hoc Edicto perpetuo sancimus, decernimus et ordinamus*, &c. By this perpetual edict we give our sanction, we decree and ordain," &c. and prescribes besides a certain form of profession of faith, to be used by all Popes for the future. Martin,‡ according to the Council's decree, issues forth his bull for the calling another Council, as he owns himself obliged to do by virtue of the same decree. Lastly,§ in a solemn manner he confirms the acts of the Council; yet after all these professions and overt acts, one hard word comes in and spoils all: he confirms all that had been done *conciliariter*; and from the ambiguity of this word, those who are against the superiority of Councils take advantage to say, that those canons which determine that, were never confirmed, though their adversaries have reason to insist, that whatever the meaning of the word may be, yet it is great injustice to exclude the most regular and unanimous acts of the Council from the extent of it.

3. Martin V., Pius II., and Julius II. did notwithstanding set forth their constitutions, forbidding appeals from the Pope to a General Council; which constitutions are inserted into the *Bulla Cœnæ Domini*, though to deny the lawfulness of such appeals is esteemed by Gerson|| no better than down-

* Quod ipsa Synodus in Spiritu Sancto congregata legitime Generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem representans potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etsi Papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti Schismatis, et Reformationem generalem Ecclesiæ Dei in capite et membris, &c.

† Sess. 39.

‡ Sess. 44.

§ Sess. 45.

|| Rich. Hist. Con. General. lib. 2. cap. 2. [cap. 3.] §. 25. [p. 142 Colon. 1683.

right heresy: "It is now confidently asserted to be heresy, condemned by a most express constitution of the Council of Constance, and there also put in practice;"* for in that very Council the Poles appealed from Martin to a future Council upon this occasion: one John Falkenburg, a friar,† had writ a book full of treason against the State, and had laid a design of a massacre throughout all Poland: the Poles would have his book condemned in Council, as it deserved, but Martin desired to be excused, he designed no such matter; upon which the Poles appeal, as they had reason; and immediately upon Martin's constitution forbidding appeals, Gerson published a treatise among others of the same subject under this title,‡ *An liceat in causis fidei a summo Pontifice appellare, et ejus judicium declinare?* "Whether is it lawful in matters of faith to appeal from the Pope, and to waive his judgment?" Wherein he shews that Martin's constitution overthrows not only the Councils of Pisa and Constance, but his own election too, as likewise the deposition and renunciation of John XXIII., Benedict XIII., and Gregory XII.; for how can a Pope be deposed, if no appeal can be made from him? "Cui appellationi cum respondendum esset, lata est, ut dicitur, in Consistorio Generali ac publico, quod ultimo Constantiæ celebratum est, minuta quædam sub forma Bullæ, &c. continebatque in nullo casu licere appellationem a Papa facere, nec ejus judicium in causis fidei declinare, plane contra Legem Dei Decretaque Concilii:§ When they were to answer to that appeal (says Gerson), there was drawn, as it was commonly said, in the last general or public Consistory, which was held at Constance, a short abstract in the form of a bull, &c. wherein it was affirmed, that it was lawful in no case to make an appeal from the Pope, or to decline his judgment in matters of faith, plainly against the laws of God, and the decrees of the Council;" so that here it seems we have the same Council contradicting itself.

§. XIV. 1. The Council of Basil,|| as Richerius¶ observes, was but the practick and executive part of the Council of Con-

* Constanter nunc asseritur, quod est hæresis damnata per Constitutionem expressissimam, et practicatam in Concilio Constantiensi.

† Richer. Hist. Conc. Gener. lib. 2. cap. 3. §. 22. [p. 135, ut supra.]

‡ Ibid. §. 25. [p. 142.] §. Sect. 24. p. 259. [p. 140.]

|| The Council of Basil, 1431.

¶ Lib. 3. cap. 1. §. 1. [p. 3, ut supra, Synodus Basillensis a Constantiensi velut rivus a fonte scaturit nihilque est aliud quam praxis et executio decretorum iv. v. xxxix. xl. xlv. Sessionum Concilii Constantiensis.]

stance, and therefore in the second session they lay down the fourth and fifth session of Constance as the ground and foundation upon which all their proceedings were to depend. This startled Pope Eugenius, so that he immediately sent to his legate to dissolve this Council, and indict one at Bononia, under pretence of receiving the Greeks there with more convenience, and thither he would come and preside in person. The Cardinal St. Angelo, his nuncio, dissuades him all he can. The Synod in the meantime is dealt with about a dissolution by the Bishops of Tarentum and Colosse, but is refractory; and in the third session desires his Holiness not to be troublesome, they recount to him the decrees of the Council of Constance concerning a Council's being above the Pope; in a word, they tell him plainly, it is not in his power to dissolve them. In the twelfth session they set him a time, in which if he think fit to join himself to the Council, well; if not, they cannot help it, he must take what follows: the time set was at first sixty days, and in the thirteenth session, because these were expired, and he had not revoked his bulls, whereby he pretended to have dissolved the Council, he is accused of contumacy; yet in the fourteenth session they were so kind as to enlarge the time to ninety days, and to propose three several forms to him, by which he might acknowledge the authority of the Council, and join himself to it. The Pope could not but remember how the Council of Constance had dealt with three of his predecessors, and so at last is brought to a compliance: he owns the Council to be general, and recalls the bulls issued forth for its dissolution, and declares them void; and that the Council is, and had been all along from the beginning, legal, and that his bulls to dissolve it did not in the least invalidate its authority. Hereupon his legates are admitted into the Council, but not before they had been sworn to the decrees of the fourth and fifth session of Constance, which define the superiority of Councils. This was done in the sixteenth session, but could not suffice, it seems; for in the eighteenth session they again repeat and renew these decrees now a fifth time, and give this reason for it, because it highly concerned the whole Christian world to be certified in the point, that the Pope in three cases is inferior to a Council, *viz.* when matters of faith, or the extirpation of schism, or the reformation of the Church *in capite et membris* is in agitation.

2. Now one would imagine all had been well between the Pope and the Council; yet no sooner was the Emperor Sigismund dead, of whom he stood most in awe, but Eugenius appoints

a Council at Ferrara, and that of Basil is as angry and peremptory with him as ever, and, session the twenty-sixth, sends him word, that unless he appear either in person or by his legate, within sixty days, they will proceed against him; and they are as good as their word, for at the end of that term of time, they pronounce his bull void, and shew the invalidity of it in all particulars, insisting on the Council of Constance. Session the thirty-third they proceed yet higher, and, in vindication of that Council, pronounce all those heretics, that deny the superiority of Councils, and hereupon pronounce Eugenius not only a heretic, but a heretic relapsed; and this they did after the most strict and deliberate determination, in the most deliberate and solemn manner.

3. Thus we see the decrees of the Council of Constance were in five several sessions confirmed by this of Basil, all which were ratified by Eugenius himself; and Pius II. in the same bull, whereby he retracts that which he had written for the Council of Basil against Eugenius, formally approves the Council of Constance, without making any exceptions; besides, they were twice confirmed after his falling off from the Council, and all those were declared heretics, not excepting Eugenius himself, that should oppose this doctrine: so that in the sense of this Council, and of those that acknowledge its authority, about half of the Roman communion are heretics, and particularly Eugenius, with all the Popes since his time. Panormitan* indeed undertook to prove, that Eugenius was no heretic, but was answered by Segovia; and Almain, President of the Council, and Panormitan himself afterwards, wrote a treatise, *Pro autoritate, veritate et justitia Basileensis Concilii*; "for the authority, truth and justice of the Council of Basil:" which makes it evident, that what he before said was rather to serve his master the King of Arragon, then feudatory to the Pope, than to speak his own sense; and indeed there were none but the bishops of Italy and Arragon that withstood the decree. It is very well known how wonderfully the Popedom illuminated Pius II.; and Julian, cardinal of Sancta Crux, who had been as stout a champion of the Council of Basil, at last was brought over to the Pope's faction. But I cannot say Panormitan dealt so foul as these two, or as Cardinal Cusanus,† who, after he had writ for the authority of the Council of Basil against Eugenius, was at last drawn over

* Richer. lib. 3. cap. 6. §. 5. [cap. 4. p. 99. Colon. 1681.]

† Ibid. §. 6.

to his side, and was sometime after created Cardinal by Nicholas V.; upon which Richerius has this remark,* that many who stand up in defence of the truth while they are in a low condition, desert it upon hopes of making their fortune; *præsertim desiderio purpuræ cardinalitiæ*; especially with a desire to get a cardinal's hat. And upon this occasion he quotes John Major, c. 18. *comment. in Mat. vers. sin.*† “It ought not to appear strange to any body (says John Major), that more are for the Pope against a Council, than for a Council against the Pope; they may assert a Council's authority above the Pope as long as they please, since the Pope confers ecclesiastical dignities and benefices; whereas a Council has nothing to give; but, on the other hand, is a sharp censor of manners, and a rigid exactor of strict discipline.” So that in his time the greatest part of the Roman communion were heretics according to the Council of Basil's decree; but in this session whereof we have been speaking, Almain tells Panormitan,‡ “that it was falsely asserted by Panormitan, that they had more bishops of their side, when even those who openly declare for them, talk quite otherwise in private houses amongst their friends, than when they speak in the theatre of the sessions, and actions of the Council; and they used to say, that they had not liberty to give their opinion, and that they were kept in by their own princes, for fear of losing their temporalities.” He means the bishops of Italy and Arragon, for all the rest were for the decree of the three verities,§ as they are termed, of Catholic faith, whereby it is pronounced heresy to maintain the Pope's authority above that of a General Council.

The Council of Basil proceed to the election of a new Pope,

* Ibid. p. 479. [ex quo datur cognosci per multos qui veritatem in statu paupertatis defenderunt eandem spe dignitatum atque pingioris fortunæ et præsertim desiderio purpuræ cardinalitiæ deservisse. Lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 111, ut supra.]

† Nemini debere mirum videri, quod plures Papam esse supra Concilium, quam contra Concilium supra Papam, doceant, cum Papa det dignitates et beneficia Ecclesiastica, Concilium vero nihil det: imo est Censor acerrimus morum, atque disciplinæ severioris assertor. [Richer. lib. 3. cap. 4. s. 6. p. 110, ut supra.]

‡ Ibid. p. 466. [Ibid. p. 104.] Minus etiam vere dictum a Panormitano plures habere Episcopos suarum partium, cum illi ipsi, quos assecclas habet, longe aliter inter privatos parietes cum familiaribus, quam in publico sessionum et actionum theatro loqui et dicere soleant, se libertate dicendæ sententiæ non pollere, et a principibus suis præpediri metu amittendorum temporalium. [Lib. 3. cap. 2. s. 7. p. 67. Colon. 1681. Cusanus spe cardinalitus ad curiæ Romanæ partes transmigravit.]

§ Sess. 39.

and make choice of Felix V. though he soon after resigned upon the valuable consideration of being made Dean of the College of Cardinals, and perpetual Legate of the Apostolic See for all Germany.

§. XV. 1. By this means Eugenius IV. was at liberty to call the Council of Florence,* and to carry all things at his pleasure in it. Thither the Greeks are invited to enslave themselves to the Pope rather than to the Turk, and by pawning their consciences to save their bodies and their estates. The business had been in agitation under Martin V. who sent his Nuncio to Constantinople to prepare matters; and he bespeaks the Greek Emperor and the Patriarch in a very magnificent style:† “The most holy and blessed, who has the disposal of heaven, who is lord on earth, the successor of St. Peter, the Christ of the Lord, the lord of the universe, the father of kings, the light of the world, the chief priest, Pope Martin by divine Providence the Fifth, commands me, Mr. Anthony Massanus,” &c. This Nuncio, when he has done his preamble, and wiped his mouth, tells the Emperor, that his ambassadors at Rome‡ had desired an union of the Greek and Latin Churches; but the Emperor in return says, that his ambassadors went beyond their commission, if ever they proposed a union with the Roman Church in general terms; but that which they had in command was only thus much, to procure a General Council, after the order and manner of the seven holy General Councils, and then the Holy Ghost would confirm it, and establish it into a peace. In the time of Eugenius IV. the Greeks came,§ and were pressed by importunity and subtlety, and wrought upon by convenient management to consent to more than ever they designed, or than their Church would afterwards own. Bessarion, archbishop of Nice, and Isidore, archbishop of Thessalonica, for their good services were created cardinals, but not a Greek would ever own this Council, except those few that were present at it, and subscribed it, being overruled by more persuasive kind of arguments than any Marcus Ephesius and his party could

* Council of Florence, An. Dom. 1438. secundum Labbe.

† Sanctissimus et Beatissimus, qui habet cœleste arbitrium, qui est Dominus in terris, Successor Petri, Christus Domini, Dominus Universi, Regum Pater, Orbis Lumen, summus Pontifex, Papa Martinus divina providentia Papa Quintus mandat mihi Magistro Antonio Massano, &c. Acta Conc. Senens. ap. Richer l. 3. p. 289. [lib. 3. p. 11, 12. Colon. 1681.]

‡ Ibid.

§ Hist. Conc. Florent. Concil. vol. 13.

produce. I shall enter into no long story of this Council, it is sufficient that it contradicts the Councils of Constance and Basil in the point of the Pope's supremacy, and that it was its main business and design to contradict them. Bellarmine, Possevin, Binius, Duval, &c. maintain, that the decrees of the Council of Constance and Basil are nulled by a contrary decree at Florence, though Bellarmine and Duval, as Richerius observes,* retract what they have said, and contradict themselves, yet still they exclaim against all that adhere to the decrees of these two Councils as schismatics and heretics, though sometimes in a fit of good nature they would fain offer something in their excuse. Duval† makes no more account of the Council of Basil, than of the second of Ephesus; but Bellarmine‡ allows it to have been lawful till the deposition of Eugenius, though he advised,§ that this Council should be left out of the Roman edition as spurious.

2. It is pretended of late, that the Council of Florence does not set up the Pope above a General Council;|| though the same author tells us, that the Cardinal of Lorraine understood it otherwise in his *Commonitorium* to Pope Pius IV. :¶ for the Cardinal, in the name of the whole French clergy, alleges this as the reason why the Councils of Constance and Basil are received in France, but that of Florence rejected as neither legal or general, because in France it is held, that the Pope is subject to a General Council, and those who teach otherwise are accounted heretics: and he moreover affirms, that the French would sooner lose their lives, than depart from this doctrine, and admit of the titles bestowed upon the Pope in the Council of Florence. And this is enough to ruin for ever the credit of the Council of Florence with sober men (whatever fine expositions may be now put upon it by some), that the whole French nation declared against it, as neither legal nor general.

§. XVI. 1. The last** Council of Lateran is yet rather

* Lib. 3. c. 7. §. 4. [p. 201, ut supra.]

† Ibid. p. 639. [p. 210, ut supra.]

‡ Vid. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. 2. c. 13, 17. [Concilium Basileense legitime inchoatum sed illegitime terminatum. cap. 19. s. 24. p. 61. vol. 2. Prag. 1721.]

§ Ibid. p. 669. [Richer. p. 18. Colon. 1683.]

|| Launoy Epist. part. 3. ad Thom. Rulland.

¶ Id. apud F. Walsh's Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, p. 282.

** The fifth Council of Lateran, An. Dom. 1512. The second Council of Pisa, 1511.

more obnoxious than that of Florence. For the second Council of Pisa was owned and defended as* general by the French; and the Sorbonne deputed three of their body to write against Cajetan† on the point, viz. Almain, Major, and another, whose book Richerius saw in manuscript, besides the learned discourse of Philippus Decius, which Richerius gives at large. This second Council held at Pisa was called by the Emperor and the King of France, and by the Pope himself, as far as the obligation of his most solemn promise and oath could contribute towards it; but the Pope would be held by no such ties. The Council charge him with perjury, the Pope tells them they are a company of schismatics and heretics; and they are not behind-hand with him, for in their complaint to Maximilian, they tell him, that of all the wicked things which had been wont to be done by Popes, there never was such a thing as this, in which Julius had exceeded the worst of his own actions, as well as of his predecessors;‡ they charge him with breach of promise and of his oath, and make the greatest villain of him that ever lived. *Quid enim jam in Christiana Republica deterius, quid perniciosius expectari potest, quam ipse Christi vicarius? [abitur Ecclesia, opprimuntur boni, impii efferuntur, mergitur justitia colitur impietas surgunt, in sinumque recipiuntur infideles, qui vero pro ecclesia consilium capiunt illique opem et auxilium ferunt, quasi hostes ejiciuntur, opprimuntur obruuntur.]* “For what can be now expected worse, or more pernicious in the Christian religion, than the vicar of Christ himself?” though they all this while give him the title of *Sanctissimus*. Julius II. had sworn to call a Council within two years, but refused to call it any where but at Rome, and thereupon appoints one in the Lateran to oppose this at Pisa. The Council of Pisa protest against these proceedings, and declare that Julius is of a violent and heady temper, and had such a force of soldiers about him,§ that they durst not venture thither, nor durst they so much as mention the calling of a Council while they were at Rome: in fine, after a horrid

* [The Fathers in the Council of Pisa describe Cajetan as, quendam fratrem Cajetanum hominem audacem et periculosum quem desideramus pro suo merito castigari. Richer. lib. 4. pars 1. cap. 2. p. 87. Colon. 1683.]

† Richer. Hist. Con. Gen. lib. 4. part. 1. c. 2. p. 167. [p. 88. Colon. 1683.]

‡ Id. lib. 4. part. 1. c. 2. [p. 121. Colon. 1683.]

§ Apolog. Conc. Pisani ap. Richer. l. 4. part. 1. c. 2. [p. 97. s. 8, ut supra.]

charge and declaration of all his crimes, they proceed to suspend his Holiness, as they call him, in the very act of suspension.

2. It is true, the King of France and all the French clergy after the death of Julius, renounced the Council of Pisa, and adhered to the fifth of Lateran under Leo X. ; but whether this were not more consistent with their interest than with their principles, any man may see, that reads the acts of the French clergy afterwards, and considers that the Pisan Council proceeded all along upon the debates of Constance and Basil, and that the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction in the Council of Lateran was but ill received at Paris, insomuch that the Sorbonne made an appeal against the Concordat, in vindication of the decrees of Constance and Basil, and the whole clergy of France appeal from the Pope in the Council of Lateran, "*ad papam melius consultum, et futurum Concilium Generale legitime congregandum* ;* to a Pope better advsed, and to a future General Council which should be lawfully assembled."

3. Here we have the French clergy first maintaining the Council of Pisa, and then renouncing it—"denique protestantur se nomine totius Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ tum Ecclesiasticorum tum secularium, cujuscumque sint gradus, status et dignitatis, qui in Pisana interfuerunt congregatione, obtemperando mandatis Apostolicis et regis Franciæ exhortationibus, Pisano conventui jam dissoluto renunciare, et Laterano Concilio adherere,—and at last they protest in the name of the whole Gallican Church, as well ecclesiastics as seculars, of whatsoever degree, state and dignity they are, who were in the assembly at Pisa, that now in obedience to the apostolical commands, and the King of France's exhortations, they renounce the Assembly at Pisa, and stand by the Lateran Council ;" this was May 5, 1517. They renounce the Council of Lateran, and appeal to another, when nothing new, that appears, had happened in either of the Councils, to make this alteration ; for that of Pisa proceeded always upon the same grounds, and alleged the Councils of Constance and Basil in its justification, that of Lateran drove the same course under Julius II. and Leo X., as the French clergy say in their appeal from it, only the necessity of the King's affairs forced him to yield, and his whole clergy with him. But if the acknowledging or disclaim-

* Richer. Hist. l. 4. part. 2. c. 1. §. 8. p. 25. [cap. 4. p. 14, ut supra.]

ing of Councils be only a matter of state, and changeable with every turn of affairs, it is easy to see how much certainty we can have of a Council's being general, when in the space of three years the Council of Pisa shall be general, and then disavowed by the very members of it, and another received in its stead, and then this as much disclaimed as the former; and that of Pisa shall afterwards be again owned in derogation to the Lateran Council, and published out of the French King's library with the special privilege of his Most Christian Majesty, 1612.

4. Bellarmine himself* seems to confess, that there is some reason to doubt of the authority of this last Council of Lateran; and Duval, in his book, *De suprema potestate Papæ*, against Vigorius, Richerius, and others that deny its authority, durst not be positive in the main difficulty concerning the bull of Leo X., how far and to what that obligeth; but, as Richerius observes,† plays children's sport, he builds castles with nutshells, and then plucks them down again.

5. There were scarce eighty in it in all, of which about sixty only were bishops, and of these a great part Italians, and none from France, nor no ambassador.‡ It was composed, says the Advocate of Parliament,§ of a few Italian Bishops, who had no other aim but the ruin of our canonical elections, and against which the French have always protested, as it is to be seen by the History of the Concordat by M. Du Puy.

§. XVII. 1. We are come at last to the famous decreeing, reforming, defining Council of Trent,|| which is so well known that very little needs here be said of it. The French clergy, it must be confessed, and all others who maintain the Pope to be subject to a General Council, are extremely obliged to Pope Pius IV.; for, if we believe Cardinal Pallavicini, and the Guide in Controversies, who says it after him, that the Pope had nine parts of ten in the Council ready to vote the Pope superior to a General Council, and yet suffered the controversy to continue as it was. And indeed the Pope, if he had found no other restraints upon him but what were in the Council, might have done his pleasure in anything; for there were one hundred and

* De Concil. lib. 2. c. 13. [p. 53. vol. 2. Prag. 1721. De Concilio Lateranensi nonnulli dubitant au fuerit vere generale.]

† Ibid. p. 48. [Richer. lib. 4. pars 2. p. 26, ut supra.]

‡ Du Pin. dissert. 6. p. 430.

§ New Heresy, p. 103.

|| Council of Trent, A.D. 1545.

eighty-seven Italians, and but eighty-three of other nations ; so that the Italians exceeded all other nations besides by one hundred and four, a small number to secure a casting vote ; who then can deny that the Pope was infallible in the Council of Trent, and was absolutely certain to gain his point ?

2. But I shall only observe, that the decrees of reformation are not in force to this day in France, because they are thought to encroach upon the privileges of the Gallican Church ; and therefore whenever the assembly* of the clergy or kingdom of France have dealt with the King about the reception and publication of that Council, they have always put in an exception to reserve the liberties of the Gallican Church entire. And in the Low Countries,† when Margaret, Duchess of Parma, then governess there, required the magistrates of every province to make search, whether anything in the decrees of the Council of Trent were contrary to the rights of his Catholic Majesty, or to the ancient customs of their country, they animadverted upon several chapters, particularly upon C. 5. sess. 24. (which the French likewise particularly except against) and they said it was an innovation, and the King might insist upon his ancient right.

3. I think nothing can be a greater evidence that this Council was not general, than the opposition of national churches in behalf of their particular privileges in points of reformation ; for a General Council may undoubtedly prescribe to particular churches in matters of discipline, as the first General Councils did, and oblige them to a compliance for the peace and benefit of the whole, and the Council must be judge what is most conducing to that end. To deny this authority to a General Council, is plainly to lay its authority quite aside, and to receive only as much of it as particular churches shall think fit ; for it were an extravagant thing to demand absolute obedience and submission in matters of faith, when points of discipline are insisted upon against the express decrees of the Council : a Council may err in doctrine, but if it have any authority, this must extend at least to points of discipline, which are in themselves indifferent, and may be altered, as it shall seem most conducing to the good of the whole Church. Constantine,‡ after the Council of Nice, not only determined

* Gerbais de Causis majoribus, p. 347.

† Id. p. 348.

‡ Τούτων μὲν οὕτως ἰχόντων, ἀσμένως δέχεσθε τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν, καὶ θεῖαν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐντολήν· πᾶν γὰρ εἴ τι δ' ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις τῶν Ἐπισκόπων συνεδρίοις πράττεται, τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν θεῖαν βούλησιν

the controversy against Arius, but the time of keeping of Easter, and other things of order and discipline, to which all churches submitted, whatever eager debates they had amongst themselves before. The erecting the Churches of Constantinople and Jerusalem into patriarchates, and the settling of church government, was performed in the four first General Councils; yet nothing was objected against the authority of Councils in such affairs, nor did the churches, placed under the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople, insist upon their particular privileges; only the Church of Rome was unwilling to have Constantinople equalled to herself, and therefore made a troublesome but fruitless opposition in the Council of Chalcedon.

4. But if at this day the Church of Rome be so jealous of her privileges in matters of discipline, we have much more reason to be careful of the privileges of our common Christianity in matters of faith; if she insist that her bishops have authority to decide the *causæ majores*, i. e. all debates arising, whether in matters of faith or discipline, according to the decrees of General Councils; how can it be denied us to defend the ancient faith according to General Councils truly such? If they reject the decrees of reformation, how shall we subscribe Pope Pius's Creed? Nay, how shall they subscribe it? not by virtue of any obligation from this Church, but because they otherwise think the articles of it true; and for the contrary reason we cannot subscribe them, because we think them false; so that the authority of the Council of Trent is really laid aside on both hands, and the merits of the cause must be the only thing in debate. For to say that a General Council properly speaking cannot abridge a particular Church of her privileges, is to say that a particular Church is above a General Council, or at least exempt from its jurisdiction. This is well enough understood at Rome, where Gerbais' book in defence of the Gallican privileges is condemned.

§. XVIII. I have done now with their Councils, and have shewn how far Papists themselves have been from thinking them infallible, or from acknowledging most of them to be general, whatever credit they may have gained by the ignorance

ἔχει τὴν ἀναφορὰν, διὸ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν ἀδελφοῖς ἐμφανίσαντες τὰ πεπραγμένα ἤδη καὶ τὸν προειρημένον λόγον, καὶ τὴν παρατήρησιν τῆς ἀγιοτάτης ἡμέρας, ἀποδέχσθαι τε καὶ διατάττειν ὀφείλετε. Euseb. de Vita Constantini, lib. 3. cap. 20.

and superstition of latter ages, when every assembly of bishops greater than ordinary was esteemed a General Council, and every General Council voted itself infallible : for it is certain, that in the most ignorant ages they first fancied themselves infallible, and then took the liberty to say and do what they thought fit, and so imposed many superstitious conceits and gainful projects on the world for infallible truths. It now remains only to consider, whether we can meet with any better satisfaction from the consent of the present Roman Church, and to inquire whether there be any expedient to reconcile these differences concerning the authority of their several Councils. But here we are so far at a loss, that we find them in nothing more disagreeing than in the very fundamental point, upon which all the authority of Councils depends ; and so disagreeing in this, they must be at an eternal disagreement concerning the Councils themselves. For some making the Pope above a General Council, others a General Council above the Pope, and a third sort making them co-ordinate : those that place infallibility in the Pope alone, have little reason to regard a Council ; and those that place it in a Council alone, do upon occasion as little respect the Pope, or judge of General Councils by Bellarmine's rule, and seek no farther than for the Pope's confirmation ; but those that think it is in neither separately, can acquiesce in the determinations neither of Pope nor Council, unless they both concur unanimously in their determinations ; and who make the Church diffusive to be the judge of what Councils are general, and what are not so, are still at a wider difference from all the rest.

§. XIX. Our English Papists seem generally to be of the last opinion, placing the authority of the Church in the agreement of the Pope with a General Council, but making the authority of General Councils to depend upon the reception of the Church diffusive, hereby placing the authority, executively, only in General Councils confirmed by the Pope, but fundamentally and radically in the Church, upon whose approbation all depends ; but by Church they understand only the governing part of it, and such as would have a right to vote if they had been assembled in Council. This is the doctrine advanced in the book so much valued by our English Papists, "the Guide in Controversies : " and because this way has most artifice and amusement in it, they are willing to put the issue here, though most of their priests must needs have great prejudices against it from a foreign education, for the French are of the

second opinion, and the Pope with all his adherents of the first.

How well the Guide's hypothesis has been accepted abroad I am not able to say ; but it will be best guessed at by the contest that has been about the two other opinions, whether the parties seem inclinable to admit of the Guide as a reconciler.

§. XX. The Jesuits are for no less than a personal infallibility in the Pope, and that in matters of fact. This is the dispute so hotly debated of late years between them and the Jansenists : for the Pope having condemned five propositions in a posthumous book of Jansenius, entitled, *Augustinus*, forms were drawn up to be subscribed under pain of excommunication, though the propositions could nowhere be found in that book. But as the flatterers of the Court of Rome first raised the Pope above a General Council to secure him against the reformation in *capite et membris*, which the other bishops have so often required ; so the Jesuits have extended his infallibility yet farther, even to matters of fact, and so whatever he determines must be right in all cases. It was upon these grounds that subscription was to be made to the five propositions by the seculars and by the regulars of both sexes, and was enforced not only by the Pope, but by the Gallican Church. Notwithstanding certain divines, and the nuns of the Port Royal, refused to make the subscription enjoined, not that they made any scruple of the doctrine itself, which they were required to acknowledge, but because the contrary to it was nowhere to be found in the book condemned, but the Pope, they said, had been imposed upon by those who pretended to have taken the proposition out of that book. Hereupon arose a controversy concerning the infallibility of the Church and of the Pope, the Jesuits maintaining that the Pope cannot be mistaken in a matter of fact, and that therefore the propositions are in that book ; whatever ordinary readers may think of it, his Holiness has determined so, and he cannot be mistaken : for they make no scruple to assert,* that the Pope is, as infallible in matters of fact as our Saviour himself ; that he saw with the eyes of the Church, as they phrase it, and discovered those propositions by the illumination of the Holy Ghost. This is but what the Jesuits maintained in that famous thesis of December 12, 1661, in the college of Clermont, as a catholic

* *Les Imaginaires et les Visionaires, et la Traité de la Foy humaine.* Octavo a Cologne, 1683. p. 81, 86, 88.

truth repugnant to the Greek heresy concerning the primacy of the Pope, viz. "that Jesus Christ hath given to all Popes, whenever they shall speak *e cathedra*, the same infallibility himself had, both in matters of right and fact." The nuns of the Port Royal, and all others that refused to sign the formulary wherein the five propositions of Jansenius are condemned, were used with great severity, and the Archbishop of Paris would not be dissuaded from imposing the subscription. But however the Church of France might stand affected towards the Pope at that time, and in that affair, yet the opinion against the Pope's infallibility* is so generally maintained in that Church, that it is almost peculiar to it, and is termed by the Jesuits,* *Sententia Parisiensis*, A.D. 1682, the French clergy in a Synod held at Paris, determined that a General Council is above the Pope, according to the decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance. Against this determination Emanuel à Schelstrate, the present Vatican library keeper, wrote a book, printed at Antwerp, A. D. 1683, wherein he endeavours to shew, from ancient manuscripts, that those decrees of the Council of Constance, which have passed so long upon the world for authentic, and were so often approved and confirmed in the Council of Basil, are notwithstanding false; and he sticks not to affirm, that they were partly falsified by the Council of Basil, and partly obtruded upon the Council of Constance against the consent of a great number in it, and in the absence of others, and so have been imposed upon the Church ever since in so many editions, and by so many licences and approbations, particularly by the bull of Paul V., before the Roman edition of the Councils, and had the good luck never to be discovered by any before himself, when he now sets himself to oppose the determination of the French clergy.

2. But M. Schelstrate is not the only man that opposed the Gallican Church in this controversy; for George Szelepechemy, Archbishop of Gran and Primate of Hungary, put forth his Synodical letter, containing a censure of the four propositions, in which is this assertion,† *Ad solam sedem Apostolicam divino immutabili privilegio spectat, de controversiis fidei judicare*, "It only belongs to the apostolic see, by a divine immutable privilege, to judge of controversies in the faith." And he with

* New Heresy of the Jesuits, p. 79.

† Vide Notas in Censur. Hungaricam, 4. proposition. Cleri Gallicani apud Edmun. Richer. Vindicias Doctrin. major. Schol. Paris.

his bishops were so zealous in the defence of that doctrine, that they profess, in the conclusion, "they would spend the last drop of their blood rather than depart in the least from it." This proposition, January 30, 1683, the Parliament of Paris delivered to M. Edmund Pirot, syndic of the faculty, to be examined; which when the faculty had received from him, on the 1st of February they chose certain of their body to study and consider the point, and then, after due deliberation, to give their judgment upon it. This they did March the 1st, and afterwards, for three months together, in their several assemblies, which were no less than forty-five in number, the question was propounded to be disputed upon; and when they had by this means thoroughly debated and concluded the controversy, they declared, that the proposition, as it excludes bishops and General Councils from that authority which they have immediately from Christ, in judging in matters of faith, is rash, erroneous, contrary to the practice of the Church, and to the word of God, as well as to the constant doctrine of the faculty. This answer the faculty of the Sorbonne gave to the question May the 18th, and then reviewing it the day following, confirmed it moreover from the several censures which had been formerly passed by their body in this and former ages upon such tenets. Thus that reverend and learned society made the most deliberate and solemn determination that could be possibly made in any case.* But the controversy would not end here; for another author, under the name of Eugenius Lombardus, took the propositions into examination, 1685, and in contradiction to them asserts, that the Pope has authority to depose kings; that he is above a General Council; that he is infallible when he determines *e cathedra*; that he can dispense with oaths and vows made to God Almighty. And the same year M. Maimbourg answered M. Schelstrate, but Schelstrate replied the year following, and so the dispute is still depending, unless we can suppose the defence of such a cause should die with Maimbourg, and nobody else should be found to defend the Roman Catholic Church of France against the Catholic Church of Rome. Schelstrate quotes nine manuscripts of the Council of Constance, and Maimbourg ten; and, which is very surprising, the manuscripts on both sides have all the appearance of being authentic

* *Censura sacre Facultatis Theolog. Paris. ad dandum Senatui responsum, data in propositionem de qua ille quasierat, quid ipsa sentiret. Parisiis, 1683.*

which can be desired, if we may believe one of our own Church, who is a very able judge in those matters : but Maimbourg has out-voted him by one, and whether it be in confidence of this odds, or for some other reason, he is positive that the decrees of a General Council are valid without the confirmation of the Pope. But M. Schelstrate has one argument which indeed is extraordinary, in that it makes a remarkable discovery of the artifices of the Court of Rome ; for he assured the same person, that at the very same time in which the necessity of their affairs obliged Pope Martin to confirm the decrees of the Council of Basil, he contrived a secret bull, which in another age might be made use of, to weaken the authority of the general confirmation ; and withal, M. Schelstrate promised him a sight of the original of this bull.

§. XXII. Thus we see, that notwithstanding the glorious pretensions to unity, and the advantages of an infallible Church so much magnified, the divisions concerning infallibility are so many and so great, that it is only a fine pompous thing that may serve them to boast of, but is otherwise of no use : for we have at this day the Jesuits against the Jansenists ; M. Schelstrate against M. Maimbourg ; and nine manuscripts against ten ; the Archbishop of Gran against the Archbishop of Paris ; and the Synod of Hungary against that of France. Amidst so much opposition, how shall we hope to find any agreement ? The grand debate between these two contending parties is, whether the Pope or a General Council should have the pre-eminence ? There is but one way more of disagreement possible in this matter ; which is, that neither Pope nor Council is superior, but that the joint definitions of both are infallible : this way the Guide in Controversies, and his followers here in England, take. If the nature of the thing would admit any more differences of opinion, they would undoubtedly be as numberless as they are opposite, in a dispute which has so much of prejudice and interest, and so little of reason or Scripture in it. Neither is there any way to reconcile these contrary doctrines, unless they would all conclude in that, which they all helped to prove, *viz.* that there is no such thing as an infallible judge or guide here on earth. The Pope in the mean while, whom one would think it most concerns to interpose his authority, and decide the difference, yet sits by as neuter, countenancing and encouraging the one, but not by any authoritative act disavowing the other opinion : and indeed, how is it possible for him by his authority to decide

the controversy, when his authority is the very thing in controversy?

When I say, there is no way besides of disagreement possible in this matter, I speak only of the point now before us, and would not be thought by any means to exclude the infallibility of oral tradition, nor the infallibility of the church diffusive, including every member of it, nor any other infallibility which can be named; but these are disliked as much by Papists abroad as they are by Protestants at home, and are utterly inconsistent with the authority of Councils.

§. XXIII. From what has been said, I suppose it evident, that General Councils cannot be relied upon as infallible, if there were no other reason against it but this, that it is so uncertain and doubtful which Councils are general. And I can foresee nothing that can be objected against this consequence, but that the Council of Trent comprehends all the rest, and is instead of all. Which indeed magnifies the Council of Trent very much, but is not so much for the credit of all the General Councils before it; for, besides that the Council of Trent grounds many of her definitions upon the authority of General Councils that went before, I conceive that all who lived three hundred years ago, were as much concerned to know what Councils were general, as any body can be at this day; and an infallibility which could be of little or no use till since the Council of Trent, is something suspicious, unless we had better proof than the authority of that Council to recommend it. I have shewn, that that Council itself is not received in France as a General Council, but only its doctrines acknowledged for true, as they were acknowledged, they tell us, before the Council's sitting: for any thing farther they desire to be excused. And how can that Council be general enough to be infallible, which is not so far general, as to oblige a particular church in points of discipline? It is apparent from the account I have given of them, that we have but the four, or at the most but the six first General Councils without exceptions, and those most of them very considerable too; so that when all is done, we have no reason that I can see, not to be contented with our ancient Creeds, and the Councils of the first ages which have been acknowledged by all, because they teach the faith necessary to the salvation of all, while others, who have taught some particular fancies, have found a suitable reception.

§. XXIV. But if all the eighteen Councils were as general

as they are pretended to be, yet it is no good consequence, that they are infallible. I could never yet see any grounds from antiquity to believe the infallibility of General Councils: I am sure St. Augustine could believe no such thing, when he affirms, that later General Councils may correct the errors of the former in that known place.* Nor Gregory the Great,† who equals the four first General Councils to the four Gospels, but none besides, and thereby puts a manifest difference between General Councils, and so could not hold all to be infallible. If we meet with high expressions in the Fathers concerning the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Ghost in General Councils, I know no man but will acknowledge it: if they say, that the Holy Spirit did effectually guide them in the truth, this is no more than what we always profess to believe, that the first Councils did determine infallible truths, and so were not mistaken in their determinations; but it is but an ill consequence to say, that they could not be mistaken, because they were not, or that all succeeding Councils cannot possibly err, because the first Councils actually did not err.

§. XXV. It is not pretended that General Councils are infallible in matters of discipline, yet I am confident many expressions of the ancients run as high for these as for matters of faith. The first Council that ever was, that of the Apostles themselves, Acts xv. was about matters of discipline; and as the Apostles here write, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us;" so the following Councils were persuaded they had immediate directions from the Holy Ghost in things of this nature, which made the Emperor Constantine the Great, and the Council of Nice itself, urge the uniform observation of Easter in the same terms and from the same arguments that they used to enforce the Nicene Creed. And afterwards Leo I.‡ writing against the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon,

* *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. 2. cap. 3. [et ipsa concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias sunt plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati quæ sunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat et cognoscitur quod lætebat. vol. 9. s. 4. (iii.) p. 183. Paris. 1837.]

† Lib. 1. Epist. 14.

‡ Tanquam refutari nequeat, quod illicite voluerit multitudo, et illa Nicenorum Canonum per Spiritum vero sanctum ordinata conditio in aliqua unquam parte sit solubilis, (Leo Epist. ad Anatol.)—in omnibus Ecclesiis his legibus obsequentes, quæ ad pacificationem omnium Sacerdotum per 318 Antistites Spiritus sanctus instituit, (idem ad Pulcheriam.)

insists, that it contradicted the constitution of Nice, which was ordained by the Holy Ghost.

§. XXVI. 1. For my part, I cannot but think it a great presumption to imagine, that the Councils of later times should equal those of the primitive ages: for as the ancients had greater advantages than after-ages could have, to know what the Apostles taught, and how they explained their own writings by their private discourses and their sermons, and by their practice; so methinks it is highly reasonable to suppose, that they had greater assistances from above. For it seems requisite and agreeable to God's methods of transacting with mankind, to afford eminent abilities to instruct men fully in Christianity, to those on whom he bestowed a power of working miracles, to convince the world of the truth of it; and we must in reason conclude their wisdom in understanding the Scriptures, as well as their miracles to attest it, and their courage and patience in suffering for it, to have been supernatural. This cannot be denied of the Apostles themselves; and as it pleased God not to let miracles cease till he had raised up men of great parts and learning to undertake the defence of his religion, so we have the same reason to believe, that he would not till then wholly withdraw his extraordinary gifts and illuminations; for these seem to have been as necessary against the many and pernicious heresies so early sprung, as those to vindicate it against infidels. We may well allow greater force to the assertions of St. Clement, St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus, &c. than their arguments may seem to carry, because they may have more of a Divine Spirit in them than we are aware of; and so upon that account challenge a higher regard from us, than upon the score only of their reasonings. We must indeed still keep to the analogy of faith, but why should we too confidently make ourselves judges of their ways of arguing, especially from figures and allegories? Who would have known that the "rock in the wilderness was Christ," unless St. Paul had told him so? or, who would have understood the allegory of the two sons of Abraham, unless he had explained it? How can we be assured, that St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles did not explain many more types, and make many more allegorical proofs than we have delivered to us in the Scriptures? It is more than probable they did, in so many sermons to the Jews, always arguing from the Old Testament,

* 1 Cor. x. 4.

† Galat. iv.

instructed herein by our Saviour himself, and by the Holy Ghost after his ascension, as their followers and immediate successors likewise were. How then can we be assured but many of those allegorical interpretations, which some men presume to set so light by, might be the interpretations of the Apostles themselves, or of the Holy Ghost in these apostolical men, as they have been justly styled? Those I mean delivered down by primitive antiquity, made use of in all succeeding ages, till men began to be so exceeding wise as to despise them.

2. But as the authority of apostolical traditions could reach no farther than the first ages, so in succeeding times we have little reason to think, that the Holy Ghost had much to do in their Councils; Christ himself seems to have been almost excluded, since Christ's vicar, as he calls himself, has had such an absolute sway in Councils. *Si dixerit aliquis, fiet recursus ad sedem et curiam summi Pontificis, non negabimus hoc, si Theologia illic habuerit duos Doctores non partiales, non seductos, non fastuosos, non quæstuosos aut invidos, non potestati seculari, non spirituali, plus quam veritati studentes; alioquin tolerabilius esset nullos habere, quam tales pati.** "If any one shall say, there must be recourse to the see and court of the High Priest, we will not deny it, if Divinity shall have there two impartial doctors, not seduced, not proud, not covetous or envious, not favourers of the temporal and spiritual power, more than of the truth; otherwise it would be more tolerable to have none, than to endure such." Upon which Richerius cries out; *Deus Bone! Si nostra vidisset secula, quibus malum in immensum per singulos dies ita excrevit, ut semper posterior dies acerbior et nequior priore existeret et continet.* "Good God! Had he but seen our times, wherein the mischief increases so vastly every day, that the latter days have always been sharper and worse than the former, and shall always continue so." And this is to be understood, not only of discipline, but of faith and manners. *Video quod in doctrinis, quæ fidem, quæ religionem, quæ bonos et salubres respiciunt mores, vix invenietur in hac tempestate, rebus ut sunt manentibus, nec habito forti favore potentiae secularis, terminatio debita, vel expedita justitia; Experto crede, &c.†* "I see," says Gerson, "that in those doctrines

* Gerson apud Richer. l. 2. p. 262. [cap. 2. s. 24. p. 141. Colon. 1681.]

† Ibid. p. 260.

which have regard to the faith, to religion, to good and wholesome manners, there will scarce be found at this time, as things stand, though we should be backed by strong assistances of the secular power, either a just determination, or a speedy justice. Believe a man who has tried it," &c. Such have been the complaints of good men concerning the generality of the Popish clergy, and are still in our days, especially concerning all those that challenge the governing part in Councils. "I wish," says Dr. Holden,* "with all my heart, that with the loss of my blood I could blot out of the belief of all experienced men, that nothing but interest and faction are prevalent in the Court of Rome: we need not insist upon the gross ignorance of former ages, when the leading men, as we have seen in Pius II. Cusanus and others, employed all their knowledge and cunning to uphold a faction, which made them go off from one party to another, as their interest served, and use all the arts and ways of management, which are wont to be used in secular affairs."

3. This quite breaks the force of the argument that is most troublesome to a modest man, that he should oppose his own judgment, and the judgments of some few others perhaps, in comparison, to the determination of so many bishops met in council; we need but go to Nich. Clemangis' works, to Espenceus upon the Epistle to Titus, to the *Centum Gravamina*, to an entire collection of discourses to this purpose, called *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, or to the history of the Council of Trent, or to the *Concilium Delectorum Cardinalium*, to get rid of this argument, which is so plausibly urged by the Guide, and runs through all his discourses; for if men will so apparently transgress all the measures of right and wrong, we have no reason to confide much in them about what is true and false, when it is so much for their interest to uphold the opinion of infallibility, which implies industry and abilities as well as integrity. Melchior Canus asserts,† that Councils as well as Popes may err, unless they take care to use all due means in examining the doctrines defined: that Councils have sometimes acted by interest and design, is confessed on both hands; the only question is, what and how many these Councils have been? He says indeed, that as for himself, he will never admit, that any Pope or

* Holden's Lett. in Walsh's Irish Remonstr. p. 524.

† Loci Theologici, lib. 5. cap. 5.

Council has not used all necessary diligence in determining questions of faith : but what matter is it what he will admit, unless he will answer his own arguments? If he will admit the premises and deny the conclusion, what is that to us? others of his communion will own, that Popes have erred *e cathedra*; and he owns, that Honorius and other Popes have erred in matters of faith : now it is but carrying the argument one step farther (*subeunt omnino causæ eædem*) and General Councils may err in their definitions as well as Popes. His words, which are very remarkable, are these : "So that we are not to look upon those as the judgments of the Apostolic See, which are made in private, maliciously or inconsiderately, by the Pope alone, or by some few of his party ; but those which appear to have been first well examined, and by the advice of several wise men : now we have the very same reasons to say the like of Councils, if there be the same cause for it ; for we ought not to think that the Pope only should be mistaken when he is asleep, and should speak the truth when he is awake ; and that the Fathers of a Council alone should go on right sleeping or waking, and that they should discern difficulties with their eyes shut, or in the dark. It is an usual thing, believe me, for all the judges of the Church, when they publish their decrees, to be driven on by a certain rashness and suddenness of judgment, as by a wind, so that they effect nothing which may be looked upon as solid, grave or certain."

Clemangis is yet sharper : "Upon whom shall my Spirit rest, but upon the humble man, and him who trembles at my word?*" But if (as our Lord bears witness) it only rests upon these, then according to the temper of this age, there are in all probability but few such in our Councils. There are usually in every assembly great numbers of carnal or worldly men, ambitious and contentious men, swelling with that human knowledge which puffs up; see therefore the necessity of believing that the Holy Spirit has always the upper hand in Councils,* when the minds of the consulters always resist, and put a bar to any thing which might produce sounder and more saving effects; especially since the decrees of Councils proceed for the most part from the major part of the concurring votes. This I speak not positively, but by way of inquiry," &c.

But, says Bellarmine, it is a sufficient evidence that a

* Disputat. super mater. Conc. General. in Fasciculo rerum expet. et fugiend. p. 200. E.

Council has not erred, if the Pope has confirmed it; and his confirmation is the criterion of a truly General Council, or rather of infallibility; for Councils, whether general or particular, in Bellarmine's account,* cannot err, if the Pope has once confirmed them. But first, Popes have confirmed Councils which are not acknowledged to be general, as we have seen of the Councils of Constance and Basil; nay, Liberius confirmed the Council of Sirmium, which was heretical. Secondly, this involves us yet in farther difficulties; for these men, who hold, that without the Pope's confirmation no Councils can be legitimate, or of sufficient authority to propose articles of faith, are brought to this, that they assert it to be *de fide*, that the present Pope,† whatever he be, is Christ's true vicar and successor to St. Peter; which is the general opinion of the Jesuits. But how this could be *de fide*, when there were so many antipopes for about seventy years together, or how any Council can be known to be general upon these grounds, is impossible to understand, since if there should be any defect in his baptism, either as to the form or the intention of the priest, or if anything should be amiss in his election or consecration, he is by a constitution of Nicholas II., by a bull of Pius IV., and by a plain and necessary consequence from their own avowed principles, not a Pope, but an invader, and is to be anathematized and withstood by all Christian people. The French King would not acknowledge Clement VII. for Pope, till the cardinals who chose him, had sworn, that they proceeded canonically, which yet would not satisfy the University of Paris, and the French clergy. And Bellarmine‡ confesses, that it is doubtful whether the first Council of Pisa, 1409, which deposed Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. and elected Alexander V. were approved or not: but if it had been certainly rejected, Alexander VI. would certainly have styled himself, not Alexander VI. but the fifth. And it is besides, says he, almost the common opinion, that Alexander V. and John who succeeded him, were true Popes. However, of the three pretenders to the Poppedom, these were most generally owned for such. So that if a man can extend his

* De Concil. auctoritate, lib. 2. cap. 5. [p. 36. vol. 2. Prag. 1721.]

† Vid. Francisc. Long. Coriol. Prælod. ad Conc. et Carleton. cursus Theolog. tom. poster. Disp. 22. §. 3.

‡ De Conciliis, lib. 1. cap. 8. [Generale nec approbatum nec reprobatum videtur esse Concilium Pisanum quod anno 1409. deposuit Gregorium XII. et Benedictum XIII. et elegit Alexandrium V. p. 7. vol. 2. ut supra.]

faith in such an intricate business to all the circumstances requisite to the making a Pope duly qualified for the confirmation of a Council, he can have no reason to make the least scruple of whatever the Council delivers, and so may as well take the Council's word, and never stay for the Pope's confirmation.

However, the infallibility of Councils resolves itself into the infallibility of confessors at last, and every private man believes as much and no more of Councils than his confessor thinks fit to acquaint him with ; and since the Jesuits have every where almost that office, the Councils are generally received as they have put them forth, and understood as they explain them ; and will be so received and understood, though these I have mentioned, or a thousand more objections lie, against every one of them.

ROMAN FORGERIES IN THE COUNCILS

DURING

THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES,

TOGETHER WITH

AN APPENDIX

CONCERNING THE FORGERIES AND ERRORS

IN THE ANNALS OF BARONIUS.

THE INTRODUCTION.

WHEN Campian long ago undertook to defend the Roman cause, he boasted, that "he was strengthened with the firm and powerful guard of all the Councils, and that all the General Councils were on his side."* Which vain brag, the writers for the Roman Church do frequently repeat to this very day. But he that with judgment and diligence shall peruse their own allowed editions of the Councils, will easily discover the falsehood of this assertion; for there is such adding and expunging, such altering and disguising things in the body of the Councils, and such excusing, falsifying and shuffling in the notes, that a judicious reader will soon perceive these venerable records, truly set down and explained, do not favour them. But these corruptions are carried on with such confidence and cunning, that an unexperienced and unwary student may be imposed on by this specious show of venerable antiquity: for their sakes therefore, it is necessary to take a short view of that fraud and policy, which is so commonly made use of in those editions of the Councils, which pass through the Roman mint, especially in those which are in most use among us, *viz.* the edition of Severinus Binius,† and that of Labbé and Cossartius,‡ wherein Binius's notes are printed *verbatim*.

* Campian. decem rat. pag. 24, et 30.

† Edit. Bini. Concil. omn. Colon. 1618.

‡ Edit. Lab. et Cossart. Paris. An. 1671.

Which useful design was begun by a learned and ingenious gentleman, in a tract entitled, *Roman Forgeries*, printed at London, A.D. 1673 : but that author doth not follow the exact order of time, nor doth he go much beyond the Nicene Council, and even in that period he left out many plain instances ; and whereas he died before he had proceeded any farther, I resolved to begin where he left off : but for method's sake, and to make this discourse more entire, I have begun with the first century, and so proceeded according to the order of the several Councils, (only writing more briefly upon the three first centuries, which were largely treated of in that author before) deducing the account of these impostures down to the end of the fourth century, and shewing (as I go along) what artifices have been used by the editors and annotators to dress up these ancient evidences, so as to make them look favourably upon their great Diana, the supremacy, and other corruptions of the Roman Church. To this end they have published many spurious Councils, many counterfeit canons and forged decretals ; and for such as are genuine, they have frequently altered the text, both by additions and diminutions, and have so disguised the sense by partial and fallacious notes, that it will be evident (by the remarks here made upon them) their business in publishing these volumes was not to promote the truth, but to serve a party. Nor can anything else be expected from Binus's notes, which (as he owns in his preface) he took out of Baronius, Bellarmine and Possevin : the design of which three men (saith Richerius, an ingenuous Sorbonne doctor) "is evident to all men to have been no other, but to prove the Pope was appointed by Christ to be the absolute monarch, and infallible judge of his Church."* And since the notes chiefly follow Baronius, we have, as we go along, in every period, noted several of the designed falsehoods and of the contradictions, errors and mistakes in his *Annals*. Which history is so full of forgeries, false quotations, and feigned tales to set up the credit of the Roman Church, and its corrupt opinions and practices, that to discover them all would require almost as many volumes as his *Annals* make : so that we must content ourselves with some of the plainest instances which fall into this matter of the Councils, and will set them in a clear light, and shew they are as contrary to reason, as they are to true history. Which undertaking, we hope, will be many ways

* Richer. *Præf. ad Hist. Concil.*

useful. First, it will tend to the ease of those who intend to read over the tomes of the Councils, or the Annals of Baronius, and save them much time and pains by presenting the principal errors of those great volumes at one view, which they would spend a long time in searching after, if they were to gather them up as they lie dispersed. Secondly, it may be very useful to those who desire to be rightly informed in the controversies between us and the Roman Church, because it will give them a clear prospect of what Councils and other antiquities are authentic, and may be allowed for evidence in this dispute; wherein our adversaries have so little regard to their own honour, that generally one half of their evidence is such as they have either forged or corrupted. Thirdly, it will be necessary (by way of antidote) to prepare those, who by reading books so full of infection, may, by these plausible falsifications, be in danger to be seduced into a great esteem of the opinions and practices of the Roman Church; when they find so many seemingly ancient tracts and Councils brought in to justify her in all things, and see (by this false light) all ecclesiastical history and records so modelled, as to persuade their readers, that in the purest Christian times, all things were believed and done in the catholic Church just as they are now at Rome. But when it shall appear, that all this is a continued series and train of impostures, it will render their notions and practices not only suspected, but odious, as needing such vile and base artifices, to make them seem agreeable to true antiquity.

To this it may be objected, that divers of the modern writers of this Church, and especially the most learned, do now own divers of these forgeries, which we here detect, to have been spurious, and therefore it seems needless to prove that which they have already granted us. I reply, that none of them own all these corruptions, and divers of their authors cite them very confidently to this very day; and still the things themselves stand in their most approved editions of Councils, and the remarks are only in marginal notes. But since they were believed in those ages, while their supremacy and other novel doctrines were setting up, and were urged for good proofs, till these opinions had taken root; it is not satisfaction enough to renounce that evidence, of which they now have no more need, unless they disclaim the doctrines also to which they first gave credit: and till they do this, it is fit the world should know by what false evidence they first gained these points. For if a man should get an estate by bribing his jury and his witnesses,

it is not enough for him to confess these persons were suborned, unless he restore the ill-gotten lands ; and till he restore them, he ought to be upbraided with his bribery, even after he hath acknowledged it. Secondly, it may be alleged, that Junius, Rivet and Dailé abroad ; Perkins, Cook and James at home, have taken great pains on this subject ; and that the learned author of the Historical Examination of the Authority of General Councils, printed at London, 1688, hath already handled this argument. I answer, that the six former are chiefly concerned in the tracts of particular Fathers, and make few remarks on the Councils : the last indeed keeps close to the great Councils, but passes over the small ones ; and any who compares this discourse with that, will find the design, the method, and instances so different, that this discourse will still be useful in its kind, as that will be also : for here, in an accurate order, all the frauds of that Church are put together throughout every century, not only what have been observed by others, but many now first taken notice of, and not observed before. And indeed, the instances of these frauds are so many, that we have been forced to give but brief touches upon divers of the particulars, and could neither enlarge upon single instances, nor adorn the style ; our business being chiefly to direct the younger students in ecclesiastical antiquity ; and if our remarks be but so clear as to be understood by, and useful to them, we have our aim. And it is hoped this may suffice to prove, that the genuine records of Councils do condemn the modern doctrine, worship and discipline of the Roman Church, and that whatever, in these editions of them, seems to countenance those things, are forgeries and corruptions devised on purpose to set a false gloss upon their modern inventions. The methodical discovery whereof may convince any unprejudiced man, that ours is the truly ancient and catholic religion, and theirs a device of later times, which cannot be rendered any way agreeable to the primitive writings, without innumerable impostures and falsifications.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE ROMAN FORGERIES, IN THE VOLUMES OF THE COUNCILS, FOR THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

PART I.—CHAPTER I.

Of the Forgeries in the First Century.

§. 1. The volumes of the COUNCILS in the edition of Labbé and Cossartius begin with divers tracts: and in Binius's edition with several epistles, designed to prepossess the reader with false notions of the Pope's supreme power over Councils, and his party's high reverence for them, as also of the Protestants having corrupted or else rejected the greatest part of them: but this whole discourse will sufficiently shew the notorious untruth, both of their boasting concerning their own side, and of their censures concerning ours. In the account of Scripture Councils, where they pretend to recite the words of Scripture, they add, for to give colour to their new supremacy, "that Peter stood up as the principal and head:"* and again, "as the supreme and head."† St. Luke in the Acts, chap. vi. 2. saith, the twelve apostles gave the multitude leave to elect seven deacons. Binius's notes say, they had this leave by the favour and grant of Peter.‡ St. Luke, chap. xv. declares, that the question about circumcision was finally determined by St. James, who also cited Scripture for his determination, ver. 16, 17. But Binius's notes say, this matter was determined, not by Scripture but by the suffrage of the Apostles, and by the judgment of Peter.§ The same notes a little after tell us, that this Council committed the care of the circumcised converts to Peter;|| which was a poor preferment for that Apostle, if Christ had made him supreme head, and committed to him long before the care of the whole catholic Church. To these passages of holy Scripture the editors have tacked a fabulous story of the assumption of the Virgin Mary;¶ but they do not cite one

* Lab. tom. 3. [vol. 1. Petrus velut principalis et caput.* Lut. Par. 1671.] pag. 18. et Bin. tom. 1. par. 1. pag. 1.

† Ibid. pag. 20. Bin. p. 2. [tanquam apostolorum supremus et caput, ut supra.] ‡ Bin. pag. 1. col. 2. F.

§ Lab. pag. 20. Bin. pag. 2. col. 1. [Non ex scriptura sed suffragio apostolorum et iudicio Petri princeps apostolorum. Ibid.]

|| Lab. p. 21. Bin. pag. 2. col. 2.

¶ Lab. pag. 24. Bin. pag. 3. col. 2. [Aliud eo tempore ab apostolis coactum est quo beatissima Virgo Maria diem extremum obiit nempe ut triumphali ejus in coelos assumptioni interessent, ut supra.]

genuine ancient author to prove it : that book which bears the title of the Dionysius Areopagita being invented many ages after, as learned men on all sides now agree.

§. 2. That ancient collection of canons which were decreed by the apostolical men in divers Synods held during the times of persecution, is published by these editors under the title of the Canons of the holy Apostles ; and their notes affirm, they were made by the authority of the Apostles ;* yet they are not agreed either about their number or authority. They print eighty-four canons ; but the notes say, only the first fifty of them are authentic, but the rest may and ought also to be received, since they contain nothing (two of them excepted, viz. the 65th and 84th canons, which contradict the Roman Church) but what is approved by some Popes, Councils, and Fathers.† Now if (as they say) the Apostles made them, their Church hath been very negligent to lose the certain account of their number, and it is not very modest to pretend to try the Apostles' decrees by Popes, Councils and Fathers ; yet it is plain they make no distinction between the first fifty and the following thirty-four, rejecting all that oppose their present doctrine and practice, as may be seen in these instances.

The sixth canon forbids a bishop, priest or deacon (ἐκβάλλειν) to put away, or be divorced from his wife on pretence of religion : the notes pervert the sense of this canon, as if it only forbid clergymen to cast off the care of providing for their wives ; and prove this sense‡ by a false title, which Dionysius Exiguus put to this canon in his version many centuries after, and by an epistle of Pope Clement I. which all men own now to be spurious, and by an epistle of Pope Gregory, who lived in the year 600 ; as if the sense of Dionysius and Pope Gregory, when single life was superstitiously pressed upon the clergy, were good proof, that clergymen did not live with their wives many ages before that superstitious opinion was heard of. It is certain the Greek clergy are married, and cohabit with their wives, according to this Apostolical canon, and the sixteenth canon of the sixth General Council : and it is not unpleasant to observe, that these notes cite the second Council of Nice, to prove there were no canons made in the sixth General Council ; yet that very Nicene Council often quotes, and highly approves the 82nd canon of the sixth General

* Lab. pag. 53. Bin. pag. 14. col. 1. [Canones hos auctoritate apostolorum conditos eorumque traditione nobis traditos. vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.]

† Lab. et Bin. ibid. ‡ Lab. pag. 53. Bin. pag. 14. col. 2. [ut supra.]

Council, as giving some countenance to their image-worship. So that their wresting this canon apostolical from its genuine meaning,* upon such slight and false evidence, is in effect rejecting it.

The ninth canon orders all the clergy and laity who are in the Church, to receive the sacrament, unless they have a just excuse :† but the Roman Church allows the people generally to stand by and look on ; and therefore though this be one of the authentic canons before said by them to be made by the Apostles, after some shuffling to restrain it (contrary to the very words of the canon) only to the clergy ; the notes say, “this whole decree was made only by human, not by divine authority, and is now abrogated by a contrary custom.” So that if a canon of the Apostles themselves contradict a corrupt practice of their Church, it must be abrogated and rejected.

The 17th canon saith, *He that keeps a concubine, shall not be in any order of the clergy.* The notes cite some of their doctors, who affirm, that this crime doth not make a clerk irregular ;‡ and, that this canon is now revoked. The annotator himself is of opinion, it is only public keeping a concubine, by reason of the infamy, which makes a clergyman's orders void : wherefore such sinners have now more favourable casuists at Rome, than the Apostles or apostolical men were.

The 65th canon, though it have as good evidence for it as any of the rest, is rejected by the notes,§ because it forbids men to fast on Saturday, which is now a fasting-day at Rome. The notes say, no Father mentions this canon ; but presently own, that Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, the canons of the sixth General Council, Gregory Nyssen, and Anastasius Nicænus (to which we add Tertullian),|| do also speak of Saturday as a day on which fasting was forbid. The notes confess also, that the Eastern Church, and the Church of Milan in St. Ambrose's time, allowed not fasting upon Saturday ;¶ yet after all, they will not grant this canon to be genuine, only because it is very unlikely that the Church of Rome should contradict a canon of the Apostles ; whereas we have already seen, it makes no scruple to contradict them, if they agree not with their practice.

* Vid. Beveridg. Not. Concil. tom. 2. pag. 18.

† Lab. pag. 55. Bin. pag. 15. col. 1. [Vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.]

‡ Lab. pag. 56. Bin. pag. 15. col. 2. [Ibid.]

§ Lab. pag. 60. Bin. pag. 17. col. 2. [Ibid.]

|| Tertul. de jejun. adv. Psych. cap. 14, et 15. [p. 552, 553. Par. 1695.]

¶ Aug. ad Januar. ep. 118. cap. 2. et ad Casulam, ep. 86.

The notes indeed say, but without any proof, that Rome received the Saturday fast from Peter and Paul; yet they grant soon after, that after the heresy of Marcion was extinct, the Roman Church did not only lawfully but piously fast on Saturday. So that this was a private custom of the Roman Church, in which it differed from all other Churches, and they know not when it began, nor who it came from; yet for such a custom's sake they reject an apostolical canon.

The 69th canon expressly enjoins the Wednesday fast; and the notes say, that many Fathers mention it as of ancient institution; yea, these notes affirm, it was certainly a fast of the Apostle's instituting, being observed by the whole Church, and not appointed by any Council, but spoken of by authors of greatest antiquity.* Well then I hope the Roman Church (whose customs are all said to be Apostolical) do keep this Wednesday fast: they tell you, no. This Wednesday fast in their Church is changed into the Saturday fast: and so farewell to this canon also.

Lastly, the 84th canon gives us a canon of Scripture, which doth not agree with the Trent canon, for it rejects Ecclesiasticus from being canonical, and mentions not Wisdom, Tobit, Judith, nor (in old copies †) the book of Maccabees, which the Roman Church now says are canonical Scripture: and this is the true reason why the notes reject this canon: ‡ they allege indeed some other frivolous reasons, such as the leaving out the Revelations, and putting in Clement's Constitutions: but it seems very probable to me that it was not the Greeks (as the notes suggest), but that impostor (who gave these canons a false title, and called them the Apostles' Canons), which for carrying on his pious fraud left out the Revelations, being not written at that time, when he would have us believe these canons were made; and he also puts in the Constitutions which are forged in the name of the Apostles, who were to be set up as authors also of these canons: and if that were so, this 84th canon being cleared from those two corruptions, is an ancient and very authentic record of the true and genuine books of the holy Scripture; but the Romanists reject it, as being a good evidence against their new Trent canon.

§. 3. To these canons are joined a pretended Council of the

* Lab. pag. 6. [61.] Bin. pag. 18. col. 1. [Vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.]

† Dr. Cosens Histor. Canon. chap. 4.

‡ Lab. pag. 61. Bin. pag. 18. col. 2. [Ibid.]

Apostles at Antioch, first put into the tomes of the Councils by Binius, and continued by Labbé;* one canon of which allows Christians to make an image of Christ: but this notorious and improbable forgery was never heard of in any author, till that infamous second Nicene Council; which wanting proofs for image-worship from genuine antiquity impudently feigned such authorities as this pretended Council.

§. 4. The Pontifical or Lives of the Popes (which begins here) bears the title of Pope Damasus; but the Notes say Damasus "was not author of it, being evidently patched up out of two different authors, containing contradictions almost in every Pope's life:" so that no account is to be made of a writing so different from itself.† Now if this be (as it certainly is) a true character of the Pontifical, why do these editors print it? Why do the Notes so often cite it as good history? Why do their divines quote it as good authority to prove their modern corruptions to have been primitive rites?‡ since it is a manifest legend, and contained at first nothing but the bare names and continuance of the several Popes; and was filled up by Isidore Mercator, who forged the Decretal Epistles, with many improbable fictions unsuitable both to the men and times for which they were invented, and designed to be a ground for those Decretal Epistles; and to make the world believe, that all the Popes were considerable for their actions in all ages, as Dr. Pearson hath excellently proved in his learned posthumous Dissertation:§ yet not only these editors of the Councils print this corrupt legend, but their very Breviaries and Missals generally appoint the lessons out of it on the festivals of these ancient Popes; publishing in the very church, in the times of divine service, these fictions for the ground of the people's devotions on those days. I confess Binius out of Baronius hath Notes upon every Pope's life, and rejects commonly some part of it; but then it is such passages as no way concern the opinion or practice of the present Roman Church: for the passages which do agree thereto (though equally false), he generally defends, yea, cites them to prove their modern faith and usages: but as we come to the several Popes' lives, which these editors make the grand direction in

* Lab. p. 62. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671. Bin. p. 18. col. 2.]

† Lab. p. 63. Bin. p. 19. col. 2.

‡ Harding against Jewel, p. 53. Dr. James' Corrupt. of Fathers, part 1. p. 22.

§ Cestriens. dissert. posthum. lib. 2. cap. 1, 2, &c.

ecclesiastical chronology, we shall observe the many and gross errors contained in it. We begin with the life of St. Peter, whom if we do allow to have been at Rome, as this author reports, yet we cannot believe he ordained three bishops for his successors there in his lifetime, *viz.* Linus, Cletus and Clement : nor that he was buried in three several places, "in Apollo's Temple, and beside Nero's Palace in the Vatican, and beside the Triumphal Territory," which this fabulous writer affirms : nor will the annotator admit that St. Peter could be crucified by Nero in the thirty-eighth year after Christ's passion, which was three years almost after Nero's own death.

§. 5. The next place (ever since P. Crabbe's edition) is by the Roman editors allotted to a Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy,* writ of late times by some manifest sycophant of the Roman Church, yet placed here among the venerable antiquities of the Apostolic age, to clap a false bias on the unwary reader; and make him apt to believe (that which Richerius said is the main design of Bellarmine, Baronius and Possevino, in all their works, *viz.*) "that the Pope was made by Christ the infallible and absolute monarch of the Church;"† but the tract itself makes out this high claim chiefly by the Decretal Epistles, which are now confessed to be forgeries : and by the sayings of Popes, who were not to be believed in their own case :‡ to which are added some few fragments of the Fathers falsely applied, and certain false arguments, which have been confuted a thousand times. So that the placing this treatise here, serves only to shew the editor's partiality to promote a bad cause.

§. 6. The Pontifical places Linus as St. Peter's successor ; but the Notes confess, "that the Fathers are not agreed about it : "§ they own that Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Rufinus make Clement to succeed Peter; and the late learned Bishop of Chester proves Linus was dead before Peter.|| Irenæus doth not say (as the notes falsely cite him), "that Linus succeeded Peter in the government of the universal Church ;"¶ but only "that Peter and Paul delivered the administration of that Church to him, which they had founded at Rome ;" which they might do in their lifetime, while they went to preach in

* Lab. col. 65 [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 20. col. 2.

† Richer præsul. ad histor. Concil.

‡ John v. 31. nemo sibi et professor, et testis. Tert. in Marcion. lib. 5.

§ Lab. p. 72 [ut supra.] Bin. p. 24. col. 1.

|| Cestriens. diss. 2 c. 2.

¶ Iren. adver. Hær. 1. 3. c. 3.

other places. The epistle of Ignatius to Mary Cassibolite, and the verses attributed to Tertullian, which they bring for proof of this succession, are confessed to be spurious tracts. St. Jerome is dubious; and upon the whole matter, there is no certainty who was bishop of Rome next to the Apostles, and therefore the Romanists build on an ill bottom, when they lay so great weight on their personal succession.

§. 7. The like blunder there is about the next Pope: the fabulous Pontifical makes Cletus succeed Linus, and gives us several Lives of Cletus and Anacletus, making them of several nations, and to have been Popes at different times, putting Clement between them. Yet the aforesaid learned Bishop of Chester proves these were only two names of the same person: * But the Notes attempt to justify the forged Pontifical, by impudently affirming, † that, Ignatius (Anacletus's contemporary), Irenæus, Eusebius, St. Augustine and Optatus, were all mistaken, or all wronged by their transcribers, who leave out Cletus: but every candid reader will rather believe the mistake to be in the Pontifical (which is a mere heap of errors), and in the Roman Martyrology and Missal, which blindly follow it, rather than in those eminent and ancient Fathers: and every one may see the folly of the Romish Church, which venerates two several saints on two several days, one of which never had a real being: for Cletus is but the abbreviation of Anacletus's name.

§. 8. After this we have the life of Clement, wherein the Pontifical makes him succeed Cletus, under those consuls which were in office the next year after St. Peter's martyrdom, though he had assigned twenty-three years to Linus and Cletus, his pretended predecessors: ‡ which years must all be expired in one year's compass, if this account be true: and one would admire the stupidity of this author, who, though he had placed St. Peter's death so many years before Clement's entrance, as to leave room for two intermediate Popes; yet here again repeats his old fable of St. Peter's delivering the bishopric of Rome to Clement; a sufficient proof there is neither truth nor certainty in the pretended personal succession of the first Popes.

§. 9. From this Pope Clement down to the time of Siricius, who lived three hundred years after him, there are printed in these editors, after every Pope's life, divers Decretal Epistles, pretended to be writ by the several Popes, and vindicated by

* Cestriens. diss. 2. cap. 1.

† Lab. p. 74. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 25. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 75. [Ibid.] Bin. p. 25. col. 1.

Binius's Notes annexed to them : which were received in the Western Church for many hundred years together as the genuine decrees of these ancient and pious Popes, transcribed into the canon law ; and cited for many ages to justify the usurpations, and defend the corruptions of the Roman Church, to determine causes, and decide controversies in religion : and yet they are all notorious forgeries ; so that since learning was revived, divers of the most eminent Roman writers have rejected them. Cardinal Cusanus affirms, "that being compared with the times in which they are pretended to have been writ, they betray themselves."* Baronius calls them, "late invented evidences of no credit, and apocryphal ;"† yea, Labbé and Cossartius have in their edition a learned Preface to them, proving them to be forged‡ and in their margin write almost against every Epistle, "this is suspected : this is Isidore's wares," &c. and also note the very places of authors who lived long after these times, out of which large passages in them are stolen verbatim. Which clear confession of our adversaries may make some think it needless to confute them, and unnecessary to charge this forgery upon the Roman Church : but I cannot think it fit wholly to pass them by, because Turrian the Jesuit had the confidence to defend them all as genuine ; and Binius in his edition not only vindicates them by a general preface,§ but by particular notes labours to prove most of them as authentic ; and Labbé himself prints those notes at large in his edition ; so that such as do not look into his margin, may be deceived. Besides, this confession of some Romanists comes too late to compensate for the injury done to the truth, by their Church's approving them so long : and they still keep up the supremacy, and all their corrupt practices and opinions, which were set up and cherished by these forgeries ; they now take away the scaffolds, when the building can stand alone ; they execute the traitor, but enjoy freely the benefit of his treason. Moreover, while some Romanists condemn them, others go on to cite them for good authority. Harding brags, he had proved many points of faith by the epistles of Clement, Damasus, Julius Melchiades, Pontianus, Sixtus, Soter, and Symmachus.|| Dr. Thomas James shews the particular corrupt doctrines and

* Cusan. de Concord. Cath. l. 3.

† Baron. An. 865. §. 7. [vol. 15. p. 18. col. 1. Luc. 1744] et An. 102. §. 6. 7. [ibid. vol. 2. p. 15, 16.]

‡ Labbé, p. 78. [Ibid.]

§ Bin. p. 26. col. 1. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.]

|| Harding against Jewel, p. 22.

practices, which the late Roman writers defend by the spurious epistles of Clement, Marcellus, Marcus, and Hormisdas.* And the learned Cook, with infinite diligence, had cited the very places of the modern champions for the Roman opinions, and shewed what doctrines and practices they do maintain by these forged epistles.† It is also well known, that the late scribblers for that religion do follow Bellarmine and others in citing these Decretals for good authority, and that the canon law is in a great measure composed out of these epistles; by which, causes are determined at this day in all Popish countries: therefore till the Romanists erase them and the notes in their defence out of the volumes of the Councils, and expunge all the false notions taken hence out of their canon law, yea, and leave citing them in their disputes with us, we cannot think it needless to shew the apparent forgery of them; but we will not enlarge so as to disprove the particulars, but put together here our evidence against them all.

§. 10. These Epistles, though pretended to be writ in the first four centuries, were never heard of in the world till near 800 years after Christ: about which time came out a collection of Councils under the name of Isidore Hispalensis; but whereas he died A. D. 636, and this collector mentions the eleventh Council of Toledo, and the sixth General Council, which were held near fifty years after, this appears not to be the work of that Isidore, but of one Isidore Mercator, and it was first brought into France by Riculphus, bishop of Mentz, in which collection these Decretal Epistles first appeared; but the learned Hincmarus of Rheims immediately discerned them to be an imposture, and writ against them, as Baronius confesseth.‡ But though he own the cheat, he is not willing to grant the Roman Church had any hand in it, yet that is as clear as the forgery, because Hincmarus was hated and persecuted by the Pope, and forced at last to recant his censure of these Epistles; and not long after Benedictus Levita having transcribed divers passages out of them into his Capitulars, got them confirmed at Rome; which could not but cherish so advantageous a fiction that supported the supremacy, which they then did so hotly stickle for; and therefore though they came first to the birth in Spain, some conjecture they were all hatched at Rome,

* Dr. James' Corr. of Fathers, part 1. p. 4, 20, and 69.

† Rob. Coci censura Patr. per totum.

‡ Baron. Annal. An. 865. §. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. [ut supra, vol. 15. p. 16, 17, 18.]

whose evil designs and interest they are contrived to serve : but the age was so ignorant when they were invented, that there is such infamous and convincing marks of forgery upon them, as makes it very easy to prove the cheat beyond any possibility of doubting ; and we will here put the principal of them together under their proper heads.

§. 11. First, The style of these Decretals shews they were not writ within the four first centuries, wherein (at Rome especially) they writ Latin in a much more elegant style than is to be found here, where the phrases are modern, harsh, and sometimes barbarous ; so that the reader is often puzzled to reconcile them either to grammar or sense : as for example, Pope Victor's second epistle,* which of old began with *Enim*, and was mended by Binius with *semper enim* ; but still there is false Latin in it, *viz. aliquos nocere fratres velle*.† The like barbarous style may be observed in the two epistles of Pontianus,‡ and in many others. But the genuine epistles of Cornelius, preserved in Eusebius and St. Cyprian,§ are writ in a more polite style ; and, as Labbé notes, "these epistles shew how much good money differs from counterfeit, and how much gold excels counters." The like difference there is between the style of that genuine epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,|| and those silly forgeries put out in his name in the very front of these Decretals ;¶ from whence it undeniably follows, that the Decretals were not writ in the ages wherein the Latin tongue flourished, nor by those Popes whose names they bear. And this is further manifest by divers words, which were not used in the time of these Popes, but are often put into these epistles ; such is *religiositas* for piety, and *universitas* for the world, in the decretals of Dionysius ;** such is *miles* for a servant, and *senior* for a lord, in the decrees of Pope Pius,†† which are words not heard of till the time of the French empire, in that sense : such is the phrase of making oblation to redeem men's sins, and the name of the mass in Fabian's decrees.‡‡ Pope Gaius's decretal epistle mentions

* Lab. p. 595. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 79. col. 1.

† Rob. Coci Censuræ, p. 33.

‡ Lab. p. 622. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 90, et 91.

§ Ep 3, et 5. Cornel. Lab. p. 683, &c. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 111, 112, 113.

|| Edit. Lab. p. 116.

¶ Lab. p. 82, &c. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 27, &c.

** Lab. p. 827. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 185.

†† Lab. p. 576 [ut supra.] Bin. p. 71. col. 2.

‡‡ Lab. p. 650. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 101.

Pagans; but that name was not used by the Gentiles till Optatus Milevitanus's time, who first used it in that sense, saith Baronius.* Moreover, innumerable places in these epistles mention primates and patriarchs, archbishops and metropolitans, &c. which words were not used in the Christian Church in the time of those Popes, who have pretended to have writ about them: as for example, the first epistle of Clement,† the second epistle of Anacletus,‡ and many others; but no Christian writer ever used the word patriarch for a Christian bishop till Socrates Scholasticus, who writ A. D. 442.§ In like manner we find the word *apocrisiary* in Anacletus's first epistle,|| and also in the second epistle of Zephyrine;¶ yet Meursius in his Glossary cannot find any elder authority for it than Constantine's donation (forged after that emperor's time), and owns the name was not heard of before, Gloss. p. 43. The name of archdeacon also is in Clement's second epistle,** and in Pope Lucius's decrees;†† but the office and title did not come into the Church till many years after: and finally, the name of a diocesan for a Christian bishop is put into Calixtus's second epistle,‡‡ but was not used in that sense till long after his time. All which prove these epistles were writ in the later barbarous ages, and not in the time of those Popes whose names they bear.

§. 12. The same may be proved secondly, by the matter of these epistles, which is no way suitable to those grave and pious Popes, who lived in times when the Church was pestered with heresies, and oppressed with persecutions; yet these epistles do not either confute those heresies, nor comfort the Christians under persecution; but speak great words of the Roman supremacy, and of appeals, of the exemption and privileges of bishops and clergymen, of splendid altars and rich vessels for divine administrations, and the like, which make it incredible they could be writ in an age of suffering. Instances of this we have in Clement's first epistle;§§ where

* Lab. p. 925. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 172. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 91. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 30. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 526. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 47. col. 2.

§ Beveridge, Annotat. in Concil. Nicen. tom. 2. p. 52.

|| Lab. p. 511. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 42. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 606. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 82. col. 2.

** Lab. p. 98. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 34. col. 2.

†† Lab. p. 727. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 131. col. 2.

‡‡ Lab. p. 612. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 85. col. 1.

§§ Lab. p. 91. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 30.

he orders primates and patriarchs to be placed in such cities as the heathens of old had arch-flamens in: whereas the heathens then had flamens and priests in all cities. His third epistle* is directed to all princes greater and less, and commands them to obey their bishops: whereas all princes in the world at that time were Gentiles. The like absurdity appears in Calixtus's first epistle, where he gives laws to the Emperors, and all others professing piety,† as if Heliogabalus and Caracalla had been under his command. And in the second epistle of Sixtus, A. D. 260, who threatens to excommunicate the princes of Spain, who spoiled their bishops,‡ though all princes then were heathens. Marcellinus also, in a time of persecution under a heathen emperor, gives direction what is to be done by an emperor professing the true faith.§ Who can imagine Anacletus, A. D. 104, should speak of priests in little villages, and of cities which anciently had primates and patriarchs, or tell us in Trajan's time, that Rome had cast away her heathen rites?¶ Or that he should affirm "the Christian people were generally enemies to their priests;" and command the bishops to visit the thresholds of St. Peter's church before it was built?¶ Is it likely Euaristus, the next Pope, should declare, that "children could not inherit their parents' estates, if they were not baptized by a Christian priest;"** or suppose churches and altars consecrated long before the memory of any man in the parish?†† Could Pope Xystus in Adrian's persecution brag, "that Rome was the head over all bishops, and also a refuge to such as were spoiled by Christian people?"‡‡ Were there in Pope Hyginus's time (as his decrees pretend) "more churches and larger than the revenue belonging to him could repair?"§§ Is it probable Pope Pius should complain, A. D. 158, that "Christians should sacrilegiously take away whole farms dedicated to pious uses?" Yet this complaint is found in his second epistle:|||| and Binius's notes

* Lab. p. 103. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671] Bin. p. 36. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 609. [ut supra] Bin. p. 83. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 822. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 157. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 934. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 176. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 528. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 49.

¶ Decreta ejus Lab. p. 532. Bin. p. 51. col. 2.

** Lab. p. 533. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 52. col. 1.

†† Lab. p. 541. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 54. col. 1.

‡‡ Lab. p. 558. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 62. col. 2.

§§ Lab. p. 568. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 67. col. 2.

|||| Lab. p. 574. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 70. col. 2.

justify this by a forged decretal of Urban I., and by proving, that in the time of Constantine (140 years after) the heathens had taken houses from the Christians. The decree for veiling nuns at twenty-five years of age must be of later time, because it is certain no nuns were veiled then, nor were any under sixty years old allowed to profess virginity.* When all Christians were so constantly present at divine offices, and received the sacrament weekly, what need was there for Pope Soter to decree, "No priest should say mass, unless two were present," and that all should communicate on Maundy-Thursdays?† How could there be secular laws forbidding the people to conspire against their bishop, as Calixtus's decretal pretends?‡ or how could he mention the laws of the Roman and Greek emperors, so long before the empire was divided?§ Had bishops in Pope Urban's time power to banish and imprison the sacrilegious? or had they high seats in the form of a throne, erected for them in churches, as his epistle pretends?|| Could the next Pope by his decree hinder heathens and enemies to the Christian clergy from accusing them? as the first epistle of Pontianus gives out.¶ Anthrurus's epistle charges bishops in those times with changing their churches out of ambition and covetousness,** even while nothing but martyrdom was to be got by being a bishop. And Fabian is made to charge the faithful with spoiling their bishops, and citing them before the lay-tribunals;†† which is not creditable of the Christians of that age. Cornelius's genuine epistle saith, "the Christians durst not meet at prayers in any known rooms, no not in cellars under ground."‡‡ But the Pontifical, and one of his forged decretals, pretend that this same Pope had liberty to bury the Apostle St. Peter's body in Apollo's Temple, the Vatican, and the Golden Mount, that is, in three places (I suppose) at once.§§ Lucius, a martyred Pope, makes it a wonder, that in his days churches should be spoiled of their oblations, and ministers vexed;||| Pope Stephen threatens to make slaves of clerks,

* Cestriens. diss. 2. cap. 6. §. 16, &c.

† Lab. p. 587. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 75. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 612. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 85. col. 1. § Ibid.

|| Lab. p. 618. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 87. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 623. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 90. col. 1.

** Lab. p. 634. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 94. col. 2.

†† Lab. p. 636. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 95. col. 2.

‡‡ Lab. p. 682. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 113. col. 2.

§§ Lab. p. 668. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 109. col. 2.

||| Lab. p. 721. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 129. col. 1.

who accuse their bishop, and forbid laymen to complain of the clergy.* Doth it consist with the poverty of those ages, for Eutychianus to decree "that martyrs should be buried in purple?"† or with his charity, for the same Pope to forbid Christians to pray for heretics,‡ when our Lord bids them pray for their enemies? I should tire the reader and myself, if I proceed to rake together any more instances; and these may suffice to shew, that these epistles were not writ in those early ages.

§. 13. Thirdly, The same may be proved from the many absurdities found in these Decretals, arguing the author to be illiterate and ignorant: whereas the Popes, whose names they falsely bear, were prudent and learned men; however, well skilled in holy Scriptures: yet Anacletus is made to say, that the Apostles chose the seventy disciples,§ which the Gospel affirms were chosen by Christ himself. He also weakly derives Kephass (the Syriac name of Peter, signifying a stone) from the Greek word Κεφαλή, and saith it signifies a head, and proves Peter's supremacy by this silly mistake.|| It looks very ridiculously in Pope Antherus in his epistle to say, "it is not fit for one in any mean condition to judge others, nor to say anything of the ministers of the churches;"¶ but indeed the forger stole these words out of St. Jerome's first epistle to Heliodorus, and foolishly applied them to the Pope. The decretal of Stephen tells the Gallican Church what the holy apostolic and universal Church had undertaken to observe, as if they had been no part of the universal Church.** But nothing is more ridiculous than the foolish expositions of Scripture, which Popes ought to interpret infallibly; but these epistles make Pope Alexander prove, that holy water doth sanctify, by Heb. ix. 13, 14, where the ashes of an heifer are said to purify the unclean, and the blood of Christ to purge the conscience: and he interprets Hos. iv. 8, where the priests are said "to eat up the sins of the people," of blotting out their sins by their prayers.†† Pope Pius proves bishops are

* Lab. p. 732. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 134. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 913. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 167. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 921. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 171. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 527. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 48. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 529. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 49. col. 2. Vid. Causab. in Baron. p. 98.

¶ Lab. p. 630. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 92. col. 2.

** Lab. p. 729. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 132. col. 2.

†† Epist. Alex. 1. Bin. p. 57. et Ep. 2. Bin. p. 59.

only to be judged by God, because (John ii.) Christ drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple with his own hands.* Pope Amicetus proves priests ought to shave their crowns, because St. Paul saith, "It is a shame for men to have long hair," 1 Cor. xi.;† which the Apostle speaks of laymen as well as clergymen; and so the same logic would prove, that laymen also should shave their crowns. Pope Soter proves, that nuns must not touch the holy vessels, by St. Paul's saying, 2 Cor. xi. "He had espoused the Corinthians (both men and women) to one husband, even Christ."‡ Pope Stephen proves, that bishops ought not to be disturbed, by that place in the Psalms, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy work;"§ and to name no more, Pope Felix is very happy in that he can make out, that we ought not to persecute and disturb our brethren, from Rom. v. 1, 2, 3. "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son:" and from Matth. x. "Fear not them which can kill the body," &c. he proves, "we must not persecute or disturb preachers and doctors, because their souls do not die with their bodies."|| All these impertinent inferences from holy Scripture, shew the forger of these epistles was some ignorant and impudent impostor; but none can suppose those holy primitive bishops would abuse Scripture and themselves at this rate.

§. 14. Fourthly, This further appears from many quotations in these epistles, which are taken verbatim out of authors that lived and writ long after all these Popes were dead, in whose names these epistles are forged; wherefore they could not write them. Now this infallible mark of their forgery appears first, in that these epistles do all generally cite Scripture according to St. Jerome's translation,¶ which was not made in their days; yet Clement in his fourth and fifth epistles, Euaristus in both his epistles, Telesphorus in his decretal, and indeed all the rest of them, who have occasion to quote Scripture, do use the very words of St. Jerome, and that sometimes for a whole page together, as the reader will

* Lab. p. 571. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 68. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 581. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 72. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 584. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 75. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 732. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 134. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 906. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 164. col. 2.

¶ De Marca makes this an infallible note, that these Epistles are forged. De Concord. lib. 3. cap. 5.

find by comparing these quotations with the vulgar Latin Bible. But learned men know, that the Latin Fathers, who lived before St. Jerome's translation was extant, used another version very different from that; and even Pope Cornelius in that genuine epistle of his, which is preserved in St. Cyprian, doth not follow St. Jerome's translation;* but his forged ones do: which is a proof undeniable, that he who forged these epistles, lived after St. Jerome's translation was grown common. Besides, Anacletus is made to cite a long passage *verbatim* out of St. Jerome's Epistle to Nepotian, which was writ almost 300 years after his time.† Pope Eleutherius cites a law out of the Theodosian Code, *Judicantem cuncta rimari oportet, &c.*‡ which was made 300 years after this Pope's death; and this convinced Contius and Baronius, that this epistle was forged after Theodosius's reign; yet Binius hath the impudence to say, "perhaps the Code borrowed this passage from the epistle;" but Labbé is so ashamed of this bold falsehood, that in his margin he writes, "Binius in this is mistaken;" and he had reason for that note, since this is not the only place in the feigned Decretals where the Code is cited. Labbé owns that the second forged epistle for Pope Eutychianus quotes a law *verbatim* out of Cod. Theod. lib. 9. tit. 1. et 2.§ Pope Zephyrine also cites imperial laws and edicts, "forbidding men to cite a bishop despoiled of his goods, into any secular judicature, till all were restored:"|| the same passage also is cited out of the secular laws in Pope Stephen's second epistle.¶ But it is most certain there could be no such laws in these Popes' times, who lived under Pagan Emperors; nor a law to forbid the people to conspire against their bishops, which yet Calixtus cites in his second epistle.** Moreover, Antherus cites a long passage, word for word, out of St. Jerome's epistle to Heliodorus.†† Pope Lucius is made to use (as Labbé confesseth) the words of his successor Agatho, in the sixth Council of Constantinople, 300 years after:‡‡ and yet Bellarmine cites this place of the forged epistle twice, to prove the Pope's in-

* Lab. p. 683. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 113. col. 2.

† Ep. 3. Anacleti. Lab. p. 529. Bin. p. 49.

‡ Lab. p. 588. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 76. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 917. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 169. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 606. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 82. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 732. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 134. col. 1.

** Lab. p. 612. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 85. col. 1.

†† Lab. p. 630. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 92. col. 1.

‡‡ Lab. p. 721. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 129. col. 1.

fallibility, Bell. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 3. et de Verb. Dei, ib. 3. cap. 5. Pope Sixtus II.'s first epistle is stolen most of it out of Ithacius and Varimadus, who lived many ages after him.* In Eutychianus's first epistle there are two whole pages transcribed out of his successor, Pope Leo's 97th epistle,† and Gaius's decretal epistle steals two large passages from the same Pope Leo's twelfth sermon on the Passion, and his 97th epistle.‡ Finally, whosoever will take pains to observe Labbé's margin, shall find, that he, with great diligence, hath marked in the margin of all these forged epistles, the very places of later authors out of which they are stolen, and transcribed by their cheating composer, who patched them up together out of the writings of St. Hilary, St. Jerome, Pope Leo, Innocent, Gelasius, and Gregory, &c. who lived many years after all these Popes were dead; which is an unanswerable proof, that they could not be writ by those whose names they bear.

§. 15. Fifthly, Those Popes could not but know their own times; and if they had writ them, they could not have been mistaken in chronology, or in the date of their epistles; but the forger of them had so little skill in the times for which he invented them, that he is almost everywhere erroneous in his computation. The two first epistles of Clement are written to St. James after St. Peter's death; yet it is confessed by Binius, St. James died six or seven years before St. Peter. Binius would solve this by saying, "the name of James crept into the title instead of Simeon;" but alas! the name of James is repeated often in the very body of the epistles, and that proves them forged.§ The names of the consuls also, by which most of these epistles are dated, must have been right if they had been writ by these old bishops of Rome, who could not be ignorant of the true consuls in their own time; but alas! they are so generally false, that Binius in his notes in vain labours to excuse some few of them, and is forced to own the rest to be false; so that Surius was more cunning to leave all the consuls' names out of his edition, because (he saith) Calvin takes occasion from thence to despise all the epistles;|| and doubtless the dates are as true as the epistles, both having sufficient marks upon them of a modern impostor, unskilled in

* Lab. p. 820 [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 156.

† Lab. p. 914. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 168. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 925. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 172. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 82. et 98. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 27. et 34.

|| Præfat. Laur. Suriï ap. Lab. tom. 1. p. 13.

those times. And it is evident, that the Pontifical names the same false consuls; so that either one author forged the Pope's lives and their epistles, or the inventor of these epistles took the consuls' names so constantly from the Pontifical, that he imitates him in false spelling the consuls' names, and in joining men who were never consuls together; yea, because that fabulous Pontifical usually names no consuls but those in office at every Pope's entrance and death, this forger of the epistles dates them all either by the first or last consuls of every Pope, as if all the Popes had only written epistles in their first and last years. A few examples of these errors shall suffice.

The Pontifical makes Pope Euaristus to enter when Valens and Vetus were consuls, and to be martyred when Gallus and Bradua were consuls; and so the forger dates his first epistle by the names of his first consuls, and the second epistle by the consuls of his last year: but alas! both the Pontifical and epistles are woefully mistaken, since Euaristus (as Baronius proves) entered the 13th year of Trajan, that is, fourteen years after the consulship of Valens and Vetus, and two years after the consulship of Gallus and Bradua; so that by this account he writ decretal epistles long before he was Pope:* so also, whereas Pope Alexander really sat in Adrian the Emperor's time, and Trajan was dead before his entrance; yet one of his epistles is dated with Trajan as one consul, and Helianus as the other; but these two were never consuls together.† And his second epistle is dated by the consuls of Adrian's first year, whereas Pope Alexander came but into his see in Adrian's third year. I will not trouble myself with any more instances, because there are none of these dates true, and many of them with the Pontifical (which guides the forgery) so grossly false as to make Popes write epistles before they were chosen, and after they were dead;‡ which is an undeniable evidence, that the inventor of these epistles was a modern cheat, ignorant of the true times both of the consuls and the Popes. There are other errors also besides the dates, which shew the bungling author of these epistles neither understood chronology nor history. The Pontifical, before it was corrected, had made Anicetus Pope Pius's predecessor; and therefore Pius's third epistle doth not reckon him among the priests at Rome, but

* Lab. p. 532. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 51. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 542. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 55. col. 2.

‡ *Exempli gratia*, Telesphori Ep. 1. Aniceti Ep. 1. Zephyrin. 1. et. 2. Pontiani Ep. 2. Fabiani Ep. 3. Cornelii Ep. 1, 2. et in multis aliis.

puts in Eleutherius as one of Pius's presbyters,* who was but a deacon in the time of his successor Anicetus.† The same epistle makes Cerinthus the heretic to be alive, and busy at Rome in seducing men, A.D. 166; yet Binius before tells us he was present in the Synod of Jerusalem, An. Christi 51; at which Synod, if he were but nineteen years of age, he must in Pius's time have been 130; which is incredible: but Binius saith, this may be believed, "because the first epistle of Pius mentions Hermes, (named by St. Paul, Rom. xvi.) who set forth a book about this time, A.D. 158;" which Hermes, if he were but only 34 years old, An. Christi 62, when St. Paul writ his epistle to the Romans, must be 130 years of age when he set forth this book: but in conclusion, the story of Hermes and his apocryphal book is a mere fable, stolen out of the Pontifical;‡ and Binius hath no way to defend one of these fictions, but with another equally absurd. Again, Pope Victor is made to summon one Theophilus (bishop of Alexandrin) to a Council at Rome; but there was no Theophilus bishop there in Victor's time; Severus was then bishop of that see, and this Theophilus was bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine:§ but if Victor had really writ this epistle, he could not have made so gross a mistake. In like manner Antherus's epistle mentions one Eusebius, as then bishop of Alexandria,|| who was not bishop there till two or three ages after.¶ The first epistle of Pope Fabian, dated in his first year, mentions Novatus the heretic coming out of Africa to Rome, and seducing Novatian, with others; ** but Baronius out of Eusebius and St. Cyprian assures us, that Novatus came not to Rome till fifteen years after.†† Wherefore these epistles were devised by a later author, who knew neither the history nor chronology of those ages for which he invented these epistles; but had only the fabulous Pontifical in his eye, and follows it in all its errors and absurdities: so that since the Pontifical makes Pope Hyginus an Athenian, Pope Pius an Italian, and Pope Soter born in Campania; Isidore forges three epistles for Hyginus, to the Athenians; for Pius to his Italian brethren; for Soter,

* Lab. p. 576. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 70. col. 2.

† Euseb. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 22. et Brev. Rom. Maii 26.

‡ Lab. p. 572. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 68. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 593. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 78. col. 1. Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 22.

|| Lab. p. 630. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 92. col. 2.

¶ Dodwel. ap. Cestr. diss. 2. cap. 6.

** Lab. p. 636. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 92. col. 2.

†† Baron. An. 238. §. 9. [ut supra, vol. 2. p. 535.]

to all the Campanians : and when the Pontifical falsely derives several superstitious rites, begun in the corrupt ages, and other usages, to have been first appointed by some of the ancient Popes, the said Isidore upon that always forges an epistle in those Popes' names to enjoin those rites ; and hence Pope Alexander writes an epistle about holy water ;* Sixtus, about none but the clergy's touching consecrated vessels ;† Telesphorus, about keeping Lent seven weeks ;‡ Pius, about keeping Easter upon Sunday ;§ Anicetus, about shaving priests' crowns ;|| Calixtus, about four Ember weeks ;¶ and so did other Popes ; whereas most of these rites were settled long after, and only prove these epistles were forged by Isidore.

§. 16. Now, though it be so apparent and undeniable that these epistles are forged, and consequently of no authority, yet the Roman Church hath made great use of them in the ignorant ages ; for Binius notes all along in his margin what sections of them are transcribed into their canon law ; and even in later times their writers against the Protestants do commonly cite their infamous impostures to prove the supremacy of the Pope, his infallibility, and right to appeals ; as also for the exemption of the clergy, their celibacy and habits, and to prove their mass with its ceremonies, auricular confession, apocryphal books, tradition, chrism, veneration of relics and martyrs, &c., and Cook, in his *Censura Patrum*, hath noted the several epistles, and the authors which cite them, saving us the labour of instancing ; and therefore we will only make a few general observations upon this matter, and dismiss these forgeries.

Observ. 1. That since the Romanists have no other genuine ancient authors to prove these new doctrines by, but are forced generally to place these apparent forgeries in the fore-front of all their authorities, we may conclude these points of their religion are all innovations, unheard of in the primitive ages ; so that Isidore was forced to invent these epistles almost 800 years after Christ, to give some show of antiquity to them ; and these points were in those ignorant times mistaken by this means for primitive usages and opinions, and so got footing

* Epist. 1. Alexandri. [Lab. vol. 1. p. 546. n. 5. Lut. Par. 1671.]

† Sixti, Ep. 2. [pp. 556, 557, ut supra.]

‡ Telesphor. Ep. 1. [p. 559, ut supra.]

§ Pii, Ep. 1. [p. 561, ut supra.]

|| Aniceti, Epist. 1. [clerici comam non nutriant sed desuper caput in modum sphaerae radant. p. 582, ut supra.]

¶ Calixti, Epist. 1. [p. 609, ut supra.]

in the world under that disguise ; but now that the fallacy is discovered, the doctrines and practices ought to be disowned, as well as the epistles on which they are built.

Observ. II. There are many other points of the Roman religion which are not so much as mentioned in any of these forged epistles, such as worship of images, formal praying to the saints, and to the Virgin Mary ; transubstantiation, half-communion, and adoration of the host, purgatory, indulgences, and justification by merits, with some others. Now these are so new that, in Isidore's time, when he invented these epistles, they were not heard of nor received, no not in the Roman Church ; for if they had, no doubt this impostor, who was so zealous to get credit for all the opinions and usages of that Church which he knew of, would have made some Popes write epistles to justify these also ; and his silence concerning them makes it more than probable that these were all invented since the year of Christ 800.

Observ. III. Though the later Romanists frequently cite these forged Decretals, yet no genuine author or historian, for 700 years after Christ, did ever quote or mention them, no not so much as any of the Popes themselves in all that period. Now it is morally impossible so many important points should be so clearly decided by so many ancient bishops of so famous a Church, and yet no author ever take notice of it. And doubtless, when the Popes attempted to be supreme, and claimed appeals about the year 400, Zosimus and Boniface, who quarrelled with the Eastern and African bishops about these points, and were so hard put to it for evidence, as to feign some private canons were made at the first General Council of Nice, would certainly have cited these Epistles, which are so clear evidence for their pretences, if they had either seen or heard of them ; but they do not once name them in all that controversy, which shews they were not then in being : yea, those who know Church history, do clearly discern, that the main points settled by these Epistles were things disputed of about the seventh and eighth centuries, a little before Isidore's time ; and therefore these forgeries must never be cited to prove any point to be ancient or primitive.

§. 17. Observ. IV. Though the inventor of these Epistles was so zealous a bigot for the Roman cause, yet many things are to be found in them which contradict the present tenets of that Church. For whereas the Pope now claims an universal supremacy even over Jerusalem itself ; Clement's first epistle

is directed to "James the bishop of bishops, ruling the Hebrew Church of Jerusalem, and all the churches every where founded by Divine Providence."* Anacletus's first epistle orders "all the clergy present to receive, under pain of excommunication;"† which is not observed now in the Roman Church. Pope Telesphorus orders a mass on the night before Christmas, and forbids any to begin mass before nine o'clock;‡ but Binius confesses their Church doth not now observe either of these orders. Pope Hyginus forbids all foreign jurisdiction, because it is unfit they should be judged abroad, who have judges at home:§ so the third epistle of Pope Fabian appoints, that every cause shall be tried where the crime is committed: which passage is also in a genuine epistle of St. Cyprian to Cornelius.|| And all foreign jurisdiction is again forbid in Pope Felix's second epistle;¶ which passages do utterly destroy appeals to Rome, unless they can prove all the crimes in the world are committed there. The second epistle of Fabian allows the people to reprove their bishop if he err in matters of faith.** The same liberty also is given to the people in Cornelius's second epistle;†† which seems to make the people judges in matters of faith, a thing which the modern Romanists charge upon the Protestants as a great error. From these and many other passages we may see, that these impostures do not in all points agree with the present Roman Church.

§. 18. I have now done with the Epistles themselves, and proved them to be apparent forgeries; I will only give the reader some cautions about those partial notes, printed on them both in Binius and Labbé, which, though they frequently correct, confute and alter divers passages in these Epistles; yet if any thing look kindly upon the Roman Church, they magnify and vindicate it; but if it seem to condemn any of their usages, they reject and slight it: for example, Pope Pius cites Coloss. ii. 18, against worshipping angels, and the notes reject both St. Jerome's and St. Theodoret's exposition of the place, as reflecting on their Church's practice; adding, that

* Lab. p. 82. [vol. 1. pp. 82, 83. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. 1. ^^

† Lab. p. 511. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 42. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 562. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 64. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 567. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 66. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 698. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 119. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 906. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 164. col. 2.

** Lab. p. 640. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 97. col. 1.

†† Lab. p. 671. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 110. col. 2.

St. Paul condemned Cerinthus in that place, for giving too much honour to angels; yet Binius soon after tells us that Cerinthus was so far from teaching they were to be adored, that he thought they were to be hated as authors of evil.* Pope Zephyrine cites the Apostolical canons for the privileges of his see, and saith there were but seventy of them.† But Binius, in his notes, saith he refers to the seventy-third canon: yet if the reader consult that seventy-third canon, the Pope's see is not named there; yea, that canon forbids a bishop to appeal from his neighbour bishop, unless it be to a Council. Out of Calixtus's first epistle, which Labbé owns to be a manifest forgery, Binius's notes cite a testimony for the supremacy, calling it an evident testimony, and worthy to be noted.‡ Pontianus, in his exile, brags ridiculously about the dignity of priests, in his second epistle.§ And Binius's notes vindicate this improbable forgery by a spurious epistle attributed to Ignatius; which saith, "the laity must be subject to the deacons;" but Binius cites it thus, "the laity, of which number are all kings, even the most Christian kings, must be subject to the deacons:" by which falsifying the quotation, he makes the meanest deacon in the Roman Church superior to the French King. Again, in the vacancy after Fabian, the clergy of Rome and St. Cyprian wrote to each other.|| Where though the Roman clergy write with all respect to the clergy of Carthage, and give them humble advice, not commands; yea, and thank St. Cyprian for his humility in acquainting them with his affairs, not as judges of his concerns, but partners in his counsels, Binius's notes say that these letters do sufficiently shew the prerogative of the Roman Church, and that St. Cyprian not only desired the counsel, but submitted to the judgment of Rome. The first epistle of Cornelius tells a false story out of the Pontifical, about his removing the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul; and though Binius owns this part of the epistle to be forged, yet in his notes on the Pontifical,¶ he strives to reconcile the differing ways of relating this fabulous translation, and flies to miracles to make those lies hang together. Cornelius's third epistle is

* Not. Bin. in 1. Ep. Pii. Lab. p. 571. [vol. 1. p. 561. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 68.

† Lab. p. 605. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 81. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 609. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 83. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 624. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 90. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 654. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 103. col. 1.

¶ Lab. p. 667. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 108. col. 1.

genuine, being preserved in Greek by Eusebius ; and yet Binius prints a corrupt Latin version with it , which, where the Greek speaks of "one bishop in a catholic church," reads it, "in this catholic church ;" and the notes* impudently prove by this corruption, that the Pope is the sole bishop of the whole catholic Church : of which Labbé was so much ashamed, that he prints Valesius's Latin version of this epistle, wherein the ground of Binius's observation is quite taken away. St. Cyprian hath several epistles printed among the Decretals, wherein are many things which overthrow the Roman supremacy and infallibility : upon which no remark is placed,* but an obscure passage, wherein St. Cyprian saith, "that whether he or Cornelius should be the survivor, he must continue his prayers for the afflicted Christians."† There it is impertinently noted, "that the deceased pray for the living." Pope Stephen's second epistle asserts, "Primates were in use before Christianity."‡ Binius, in his notes out of Baronius, saith Herodotus confesses the same thing ; but Labbé declares, "that somebody had imposed upon Baronius, for there is no such thing to be found in Herodotus ;" and Adrian, in Vopiscus (his other authority), evidently speaks of the Christian bishop of Alexandria.§ Wherefore Pope Stephen, or he that made the epistle for him, was mistaken. It is an impudent thing also in Binius to note upon one of St. Cyprian's letters about Basildes and Martialis, "You see the primacy of the bishop of Rome:" for these two bishops were justly condemned in Spain, and unjustly absolved by the Pope; after which St. Cyprian condemns them again, only certifying the bishop of Rome, that he had justly nulled his absolution ; so that we may rather note, "You see the primacy of the bishop of Carthage."|| Pope Eutychianus's first epistle following the erroneous Pontifical,¶ orders, "that only beans and grapes shall be offered on the altar." Binius saith this is the fourth canon of the Apostles ; whereas that fourth canon doth not name beans, and the third canon forbids all kind of pulse to be offered on the altar ; so that the impostor was deceived, and Binius becomes ridiculous by attempting to defend him. I shall not need produce any more instances, these will suffice to warn those who study

* Bim. p. 112. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 703 [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bim. p. 120.

‡ Lab. p. 732. [ut supra.] Bim. p. 134. col. 1.

§ Scriptor. Hist. August. p. 960.

|| Bim. p. 136. col. 1.

¶ Lab p. 914. [ut supra.] Bim. p. 168. col. 1.

the Councils, not to rely upon any thing in these notes, which are so full of partiality and errors, of weak reasonings and false quotations, of ignorant and wilful mistakes, that there is little heed to be given to them.

§. 19. I doubt I have been too tedious in discovering the forgeries of these Decretal Epistles; but the reader must consider, they take up the greatest part of this first period in the volumes of the Councils, and we have here considered them all together: and now we have nothing to observe in this century, except the Apostolical Constitutions, which are left out in Binius, but printed in Labbé, in Greek and Latin, next after Clement's genuine Epistle to the Corinthians. Now, the Constitutions are a very ancient forgery, compiled about the end of the fourth, and beginning of the fifth century, of the rites of which ages they give a very good account, and have little or nothing in them to justify the more modern corruptions of Rome; for which cause it is likely Binius omitted them. But if we know beforehand that the Apostles did not make them, nor Clement bishop of Rome collect them, and can pardon the boldness of making the Apostles the speakers, they are useful to be read, as a writing composed in the fourth or fifth age.

CHAP. II.

Of the Forgeries in the Second Century.

§. 1. THIS period begins with the life of Anacletus, who was made Pope, as they say, A.D. 104, but the fabulous Pontifical brings him in the tenth consulship of Domitian, that is, just upon the fictitious Cletus's death, and before Clement entered, who yet is there said to be his predecessor; so blundered and uncertain is that ignorant writer; yet, except what he saith, no other author mentions any deeds of Anacletus; and though Binius in his notes affirms, Anacletus was most famous for many eminent deeds,* yet he cannot name one of them.

Euaristus's life follows, whom the Pontifical, and the Breviary of Sixtus V.† make to have been Pope in the time of Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan; but Binius out of Baronius takes upon him to correct both the Pontifical and the Roman

* Lab. p. 511. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 42. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 532. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 51. col. 2.

Office also, assuring us he began in the thirteenth year of Trajan ; but alas ! these first Bishops of Rome were so obscure that nothing but their name is upon record in authentic authors. And what is said in the Pontifical, and the notes concerning their several parents, countries, times of sitting in that see, and all their actions almost, are mere impostures of later ages, as the learned Dr. Pearson proves in his afore-cited posthumous dissertation.

Alexander's life is next, wherein Binius again corrects the Pontifical and the Breviary ; which say, " he ruled the Church in the days of Trajan ; " * affirming, he entered not on the Papacy till Adrian's time. But there was more need to correct the Breviary of his infallible Church, for those fabulous lessons it orders to be read in the Church on this Pope's day, about Alexander's converting Hermes, a prefect of Rome, Quirinus, a tribune, and Balbina his daughter, who also is sainted ; yet after all, there were no such persons in those offices in Rome at that time ; † and the whole story is a fiction taken out of a fabulous tract called the Acts of Alexander ; yet this legend Binius's notes defend.

Of Xystus, the next Pope, nothing is memorable, but that he is said by the Pontifical to be a martyr. Eusebius saith, he died in Adrian's twelfth year, and mentions not his martyrdom ; ‡ but Binius contradicts him, and will have him to suffer in the third year of Antoninus : § and this without any authority for it but his own.

Telesphorus, according to Eusebius, was the seventh Pope from St. Peter, and came in the twelfth year of Adrian, || that is, A.D. 130. But Binius, following the Pontifical, makes him the eighth Pope, and saith he entered the third year of Antoninus, that is twelve years after ; and in the notes on his life, ¶ upon the Pontifical's saying, he ordained thirteen bishops in his eleven years, he observes, " that these bishops were to be sent into divers parts of the world ; from whence (he saith) it is clear that the Pope was to take care not of Rome only, but the whole world." But first, no inference from so fabulous an author as the Pontifical can be clear. And secondly, if there were so many bishops really ordained by Popes, as

* Lab. p. 541. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 55. col. 1. Brev. Sixt. 5. in Maii 3.

† Cestriens. dissert. posthum. diss 2. cap. 7. p. 227.

‡ Euseb. lib. 4. c. 5. § Lab. p. 554. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 60. col. 2.

|| Euseb. ut supra. ¶ Lab. p. 559. [ut supra.] Bin p. 63. col. 2.

the Pontifical doth pretend, there are but sixty-three bishops reckoned by him from St. Peter's death to this time, which is near 100 years. From whence (if we grant the matter of fact) it is rather clear, that the Pope ordained only some Italian bishops near Rome; for otherwise, when so many bishops were martyred, there must have been far more ordained for the world in that space of time.

Ilyginus, the next Pope, began (saith Eusebius) in the first year of Antoninus; but Binius saith, he was made Pope the fifteenth of that emperor: the reader will guess whether is to be trusted. The Pontifical could find this Pope nothing to do but to distribute the orders of the clergy, which Pope Clement (according to him) had done long before.*

§. 2. From the notes on Pope Pius's life,† we may observe, that there was no great care of old taken about the Pope's succession: for Optatus,‡ St. Augustine, and St. Jerome, with the old Pontifical (before it was altered†), place Anicetus before Pius; but the Greeks place Pius before Anicetus, and in this Binius thinks we are to believe them rather than the Latins. The rest of the notes are spent in vindicating an improbable story of an angel bringing a decree about Easter to Hermes, the Pope's brother, who wrote a book about keeping it on the Lord's Day: yet after all, there is a book of Hermes now extant, that hath nothing in it about Easter; there was a book of old written by Hermes, well known to the Greeks, and almost unknown to the Latins (though written by a Pope's brother), read in the Eastern churches, and accounted apocryphal in the Western: but we want another angel to come and tell us, whether that now extant be the same or no, for Binius cannot resolve us, and only shows his folly in defending the absurd and incongruous tales of the Pontifical.

Anicetus either lived before or after Pius, and the Pontifical makes him very busy in shaving his priests' crowns, never mentioning what he did to suppress those many heretics who came to Rome in his time; but it tells us he was buried in the cemetery of Calistus,§ though Calistus (who gave that burial-place a name) did not die till fifty years after Anicetus. But Binius (who is loth to own this gross falsehood) saith, "You are to understand it in that ground which Calistus made a burying-

* Lab. p. 565. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 65. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 568. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 67. col. 2.

‡ Cestriens. diss. 2. cap. 11. p. 65.

§ Lab. p. 579. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 72. col. 1.

place afterward;" yet it unluckily falls out, that Anicetus's successor,

Pope Soter, was also buried (according to the Pontifical) in Calistus's cemetery; and afterwards Pope Zephyrine's burial-place is described to be not far from that of Calistus; so well was Calistus's cemetery known, even before it was made a cemetery, and before he was Pope.

Eleutherius succeeded Soter, and, as the Pontifical saith, he received a letter from Lucius, king of Britain, that he might be made a Christian by his command, which hint, probably, first produced those two epistles between this Pope and King Lucius,* which Binius leaves out, though he justifies the story, of which it were well we had better evidence than the Pontifical. This is certain, the epistles were forged in an age when men could write neither good Latin nor good sense; and I am apt to fancy, if Isidore had put them into a decretal, they would have been somewhat more polite: so that it is likely these epistles were made by some monks, who thought it much for our honour, to have our Christianity from Rome.

§. 3. This century concludes with the bold Pope Victor, of whose excommunicating the Eastern bishops (for not agreeing with him about Easter) we have a large account in Eusebius,† but of that there is nothing in the Pontifical, only we are told he held a Council at Rome, to which he called Theophilus (bishop of Alexandria), and decreed Easter should be observed upon a Sunday, &c. Upon this hint, and the authority of a better author, we grant there were at these times divers Councils held about keeping Easter: but the editors of the Councils (though Eusebius be the only credible author which gives an account of them) presume to contradict him. For Eusebius makes the Council of Cæsarea in Palestine to be first, and makes Theophilus of that city, and Narcissus of Jerusalem, presidents of it; but the editors (for the honour of the Pope) place the Roman Council first,‡ and upon the bare credit of the Pontifical (who mistook Alexandria for Cæsarea) say, that Theophilus was present at it; whereas Eusebius saith, this Roman Council was the second called about this question, consisting of the bishops about Rome. Secondly, the editors place the Council of Cæsarea, affirming out of a suspicious frag-

* Usseii Antiq. Brit. cap. 4, 5, &c. et ap. Spelm. tom. 1. Concil.

† Euseb. Hist. lib. 5. c. 23, 24, &c.

‡ Lab. p. 596. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 79. col. 1. Vid. Euseb. lib 5. cap. 22.

ment of Bede (who lived many centuries after), that it was called by Victor's authority; whereas Eusebius (as we see) assigns other presidents to that Council; yea, they entitle all the other Councils about this matter, under Victor, though in Eusebius they are set down as independent upon one another, the bishops of each country calling them by their own authority. And though Binius's notes* brag of apostolical and universal tradition, the bishops of Asia produced a contrary tradition, and called it apostolical, for keeping Easter at a different time, which shews how uncertain a ground tradition is for articles of faith, when it varied so much in delivering down a practical rite through little more than one century, and the Asian bishops persisting in their custom, and despising Victor's excommunication, proves they knew nothing of his supremacy or infallibility in those days. We grant Victor was in the right as to the time of Easter, and that which he and other Councils now agreed on, was agreed upon also at the Council of Nice; but Binius stretches it too far when he pretends that General Council confirmed Victor's sentence and excommunication: for Victor's authority is never urged in the Nicene Council, nor his excommunication mentioned; and we know from Eusebius, that the bishops of his own opinion severely reprov'd him for offering to pass so rash a sentence, and to impose his sense upon remote churches: so that thus far there is no genuine proof of any supremacy exercised or claimed by the Roman Church; for the Decretals, which only pretend to make it out, are notorious forgeries.

CHAP. III.

Of the Forgeries in the Third Century.

§.1. THIS century† begins with the life of Pope Zephyrine, who sat eight years, saith the Pontifical; but the notes tell you he sat eighteen; which is a small error in that fabulous author; yet the editors believe upon his credit, that this Pope ordered vessels of glass to be used in the mass;‡ and the notes prove it by Pope Gregory the Great, who lived 400 years after this

* Lab. p. 598. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 80. col. 1.

† An. Dom. 203.

‡ Lab. p. 603. [ut supra] Bin. p. 81. col. 1.

time. However, if we allow the matter of fact upon the testimonies of St. Jerome and Epiphanius, it will follow, that in those ages (when they used glass cups) they did not believe transubstantiation; for if they had, they would not have ventured Christ's blood in so brittle a vessel, but have forbid the use of glasses, as they have done in the Roman Church since this opinion came in among them.*

Under this Pope the editors place an African Council, and say it was reprobated; yet they cannot make it appear that this Pope so much as knew of it. Nor was his advice or consent at all desired in that case, which was never disputed at Rome till Pope Stephen's time (as themselves confess), *viz.* fifty years after this Council was held: from whence we learn, that every province in this age believed they had sufficient authority to determine controversies in religion among themselves, without the consent of the Bishop of Rome.

§. 2. Though the Pontifical be guilty of many errors in the life of Calixtus, and mistake the very emperors under which he lived and died, the notes gloss them all fairly over,† and correct them by the Roman martyrology, which often follows the Pontifical, and is as fabulous as that. However, we are told, that Calixtus was buried three miles out of the city, because the law of the twelve tables forbade the burying of a dead body within the walls. Now I would know, if this law were in force, how that can be true which the Pontifical and the notes affirm and justify, that St. Peter, Linus, Cletus, Euaristus, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, and Victor, were all buried in the Vatican? And what shall we think of the miracles done by their relics and at their tombs, if nobody knew where they were first buried.

Pope Urban, the successor of Calixtus, is said in the Pontifical,‡ to be buried in the cemetery of Prætextatus, which could not then be any cemetery at all, because Prætextatus was not martyred till the persecution under Maximinus, which happened many years after: and if the story of St. Cecily, in the same author, be no truer than his chronology, the Romanists worship a fictitious saint.

The Pontifical is forced to feign, that the Emperor Alexander Severus was a persecutor, contrary to his character in all histories of credit; and this only to make us think, that

* Daillé de Cult. Relig. apud Latin. lib. 2. cap. 22.

† Lab. p. 608. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 83. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 617. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 87. col. 1

Calixtus, Urban, and Pope Pontianus his successor, were martyrs. However, though Eusebius knew not of their martyrdom,* the Roman Church adores them all as martyrs, and hath peculiar days dedicated to their memories.

Antherus (as the Pontifical says) sat twelve years and one month; and the notes say, that he sat only one month;† so that there is but only twelve years mistaken in this Pope's life: and if he was Pope but one month, doubtless his secretaries had need be very swift writers, or else they could not gather many acts in his time. However Binius will make it out, for he brings in a poetical hyperbole, "of those scribes, who could write a sentence before a man had spoken it; and so were as quick at guessing as writing;" and applies this in very serious earnest to this Pope's notaries, to make us imagine there were many acts of martyrs writ out in this short-lived Pope's time.

§. 3. Pope Fabian, as Eusebius relates, was chosen by occasion of a dove's lighting on his head, when the people were met to elect a Pope; of which remarkable story the fabulous Pontifical takes no notice, but tells us, that in this Pope's time Novatus the heretic came to Rome;‡ that is, say the notes, above a year after Pope Fabian was dead, after the vacancy, and in Pope Cornelius's time; with such absurd comments do these gentlemen delight to cover the ignorance and falsehood of their historian; but such excuses do only more expose him. In this Pope's time were two Councils held, one in Africa, the other in Arabia, and they entitle them both under Fabian; yet the only authors who mention these Councils, do not say Pope Fabian was concerned in either of them,§ and therefore they were not under Fabian.

After this Pope's death, there was a vacancy of more than one whole year, which the editors, to flatter the Papacy, call (in the style of princes) an *interregnum*; but alas! their admired monarchy was now turned into an aristocracy, and the clergy governed the Roman Church; to excuse which flaw in their visible monarchical succession, the notes say, "the members next the head knew it was their parts, to do the office of the head;" which notable kind of substitution, if it could be made out in the body natural, beheading would not be a mortal

* Euseb. Hist. lib. 6. cap. 15, 17, et 22.

† Lab. p. 629. [vol 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 92. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 638. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 95. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 650. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 101. col. 2.

punishment ; however, they must say something to make us believe there was always a visible head of the Catholic Church, or at least a neck and shoulders which stood for an head, till Cornelius was chosen Pope : and they called a Council (as they pretend) in this vacancy, and writ a letter of their determination to all the churches in the world, that they might all observe what the empty chair of Peter had ordered.* But if any one read the letter itself, it will appear that this Council was only a voluntary assembly of the clergy in Rome, and they met only to confirm St. Cyprian's opinion, and only writ their letter to him ; but never pretended either to be judges over Cyprian or any other part of the catholic Church.

Pope Cornelius's life follows, for whose character we are more obliged to St. Cyprian's Epistles, than to the Pontifical, which invents an idle story of a dialogue between Cornelius and Decius the Emperor ; and though the notes own,† that Decius (who is here pretended to martyr him) died the same month in which Cornelius entered ; yet they will not own the story to be false, but boldly put in the name of Volusianus into their margin instead of Decius. However, the Breviary‡ retains the fiction of Cornelius suffering under Decius, as it doth also the fable of his translating the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul ; but let any considering man compare the different ways of telling this sham story, and he will easily discern, that the notes cannot reconcile them without flying to a miracle.§ It is evident they have told us, the body of St. Peter was in the Vatican, when Pope Victor was there buried, A.D. 203. And there is no author of credit mentions their removal into the catacombs, and so consequently no reason to believe they were fetched back from thence in a time of persecution. Pope Gregory lived 350 years after this, and was very apt to credit feigned miracles, and he differs much from the Pontifical ; so that probably the whole story is forged, by those who long after began superstitiously to adore the relics of saints. However, it is read in the Roman Church, September 16, and many devout people, on the credit of this legend, make pilgrimages, and offer prayers and large gifts, to the shrines of these two Apostles, of whose true relics they can have none, because their real graves are not known.

* Bin. p. 107. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 665. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 108. col. 1.

‡ Breviar. Sixt. 5. 16 die Septemb.

§ Lab. p. 667. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 108. col. 1.

In this Pope's time there were two Councils holden at Carthage, two at Rome, and one in Italy; all which, in the general titles, are said to be held under Cornelius;* though the notes assure us that those two at Carthage were called by St. Cyprian's authority, and that the Italian bishops made a decree of their own, besides that of Cornelius at Rome. The Roman Councils indeed were holden under Cornelius, as being bishop of that city; but we may observe, he did not authoritatively confirm the sentence of the Council of Carthage, but only consented to it. We may also note, this African Council calls not Pope Cornelius Father, but Brother, and writes to him as one of their colleagues; yea, they do not except Cornelius, when they decree, that if any of their colleagues agreed not to their sentence, he should answer it at the day of judgment.† Moreover, in the same letter there is an evident testimony, that the people in those days were prepared for martyrdom, by receiving the eucharistical cup;‡ which being now denied to the laity the editors pass it by without a note; yet soon after, where the Council plainly speaks of confessing the name of Christ before persecutors, they have this impertinent marginal note, "from this and other places, the necessity of confession is confirmed;" as if this belonged to their new-invented auricular confession.

§. 4. The notes find divers faults in the life of Pope Lucius, yet they would palliate the grossest of all; for the Pontifical says he was beheaded by Valerian; the notes affirm it was by Gallus and Volusianus; and yet the same notes tell us the Pontifical (in saying it was by Valerian) may be very well and truly expounded.§ The reader must understand, it may be so expounded by such kind of notes as are designed to make gross errors seem great truths.

Pope Stephen, who succeeded Lucius, fell out with Cyprian and the African bishops about the rebaptizing of heretics, which (though it were the only memorable thing in the Pope's life) the Pontifical never mentions: and the editors are so used to put into the title of all Councils under such or such a Pope, that in this Pope's time they style those very Councils, *sub Stephano*, which were called without his knowledge, and which condemned his opinion,|| as may be seen in the Councils of

* Lab. p. 714. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 126. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 718 [ut supra.] Bin. p. 128. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 717. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 127. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 720. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 128. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 751, 760, &c. Bin. p. 137, 141, 145, &c.

Carthage, Iconium, and Africa, where (so easily may tradition be mistaken) the rebaptizing of heretics is asserted to be an apostolic tradition, though it were contrary to Pope Stephen's opinion, and the tradition of the Roman Church. And when Stephen, on this account, presumed to excommunicate the Asian bishops, Firmilianus (bishop of Cæsarea), in a letter to St. Cyprian,* despises his sentence, compares the Pope to Judas, complains of his arrogance, and esteems those to be very silly who took the Roman bishop's word for an apostolic tradition, from which that Church in many instances had departed. Moreover, he calls him a schismatic, and affirms he had by this rash sentence only cut himself off from the unity of the catholic Church. St. Cyprian also, and his Africans,† condemned this Pope as a favourer of heretics, an enemy to the Church, and one who writ contradictions, and was void of prudence; describing him as an innovator and bringer in of traditions contrary to God's word, as one who obstinately presumed to prefer human doctrines before Scripture. • I grant Pope Stephen was in the right in this controversy; yet doubtless, if these bishops had believed the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope and his Roman Council, they could not have used him at this rate: and the editors are so concerned to cover this rough usage, that they reprint an epistle of St. Cyprian's *verbatim*,‡ after this quarrel was grown hot, which was writ while they two were friends, and contains very kind words to Stephen; which blind is only to make us think that Cyprian submitted to the Pope at last, though it is apparent he never did so. Again, the reader may note, that Labbé here prints a tract of some ancient author to justify the Pope's opinion; but though there be many good arguments for it from other topics, the argument from tradition, and the determination of the Roman Church, is not urged in the whole discourse,§ which shews that these were no arguments allowed in this writer's time. Lastly, whereas, the third Council of Carthage severely censures Pope Stephen "for taking upon him as bishop of bishops, and for compelling his equals by tyrannical terrors to obey him:"|| Binius impudently notes upon this, "that the Pope was called

* Lab. p. 751. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 141. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 765. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 147. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 740, et p. 764. Bin. p. 136. col. 2. et p. 146. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 770. [ut supra.]

|| Lab. p. 786. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 149. col. 2. et p. 154. col. 2.

bishop of bishops, to him was the last refuge in matters of faith, and his determinations were received all the world over as the oracles of the Holy Ghost :” which is from his usurping a title and authority to infer he had right to them ; and to prove that all the world received his determinations from a story which shews that half the Christian world rejected them.

§. 5. The life of Sixtus II. in the Pontifical, is one heap of errors, for the author seems to mistake him for Xystus the philosopher, and, as the notes confess, make Decius raise a great persecution against the Church eight years after he was dead. He also places Valerian before Decius, supposing them to reign together, and saying Sixtus was beheaded by Valerian in Decius’s time ;* now Decius was slain two years before Valerian was emperor : yet the notes labour to colour over all these contradictions to save the credit of their Missals and fabulous Martyrology.

Dionysius the next Pope is said to have been a monk, upon the credit of the Pontifical ;† the notes add, that he lived a solitary life before his election ; yet the modern monks have given over that primitive custom, and now crowd into great cities : but the Pontifical is so miserably mistaken in the consuls in this Pope’s life, placing those for his last consuls who were so two years before those he names for his first consuls, that nothing can be believed on this author’s credit. Under this Pope the editors have feigned a Council at Rome, to which Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, was cited, and so far obeyed the order as to write an epistle to clear himself, for which they cite Athanasius.‡ But we must never trust their quotations, where the supremacy is concerned, without looking into the authors they cite : and Athanasius only saith Dionysius of Alexandria was accused at Rome, and wrote to the Pope to know the articles complained of, who sent him an account, upon which he vindicated himself by an apology : but what is all this to a Roman Council, or a citing Dionysius thither ? There were also two Councils at Antioch about this time, as Eusebius tells us :§ but the editors, of their own head, put in, that the first of them was appointed by Dionysius, bishop of Rome, to whom the chief care of the Church

* Lab. p. 819. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 155. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 827. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 158. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 830. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 160. col. 1.

§ Euseb. Hist. lib. 7. c. 22.

was committed : whereas Eusebius never mentions this Pope as being either concerned in the Council or consulted about it ; but if they will have it under Dionysius, then we may infer that this Pope approved a saying of this Council, *viz* that they knew of no other mediator between God and man, but only Christ Jesus. The second Council of Antioch is entitled also under Pope Dionysius : yet it appears by Eusebius,* that this Pope knew not of the Council till they, by their synodical epistle, informed him of it after they were risen : and in that epistle they join him and Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, together as colleagues and equals, not desiring either of them to confirm their decrees ; but acquainting them with their proceedings, they required them to shew their consent by writing communicatory letters to Domnus, who was put in by them bishop of Antioch, in the room of Paulus Samosatenus, ejected for heresy ; and though this Domnus's father, Demetrianus, had been bishop of Antioch before, yet we hear of no Papal dispensation to allow him to succeed there. We may also observe, that Firmilianus (who in Pope Stephen's time so much despised the Pope's authority and infallibility) is by this Council called a man of blessed memory. By which we see how little any ancient and genuine Councils do countenance the supremacy of the Roman Church, and what need they had to forge evidence, who would have it taken for a primitive doctrine.

§. 6. That Felix I. was a martyr is proved only by the Pontifical, and the Roman Martyrology which often blindly follows it : but why may not the Pontifical be mistaken in the martyrdom, as well as the notes confess it to be in the consuls ?† And the base partiality of the notes appears soon after in citing a place of St. Cyprian, as if he desired to know the days on which the martyrs suffered, that he might offer a sacrifice for them by names on their anniversaries ;‡ whereas Cyprian speaks of the confessors who died privately in prisons, of whose names he desires to be informed, that he might celebrate their memory among the martyrs : now there is a great difference between St. Cyprian's and the Protestants' practice to commemorate the saints departed, and the Roman way of offering the sacrifice of the mass for the deceased : yet the

* Euseb. Hist. lib. 7. c. 24.

† Leb. p. 903. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 163. col. 1.

‡ Cyp. lib. 3. ep. 6. vel epist. 37. p. 81. vid. Daillé, de Cult. Relig. Lat. lib. 3. c. 3. p. 352.

notes would suborn St. Cyprian to give in evidence for this corrupt practice.

Pope Eutychianus lived not long before Eusebius's time, and he saith he only sat ten months;* the Pontifical allows him thirteen months, but the notes boldly say he was Pope eight years,† and this only upon the names of two consuls set down in the Pontifical and the credit of the Roman Martyrology; but since these two are scarce ever right in their chronology, we ought to believe Eusebius rather than the annotator and his despicable witnesses.

His successor Gaius lived in Eusebius's own time, and he affirms he sat fifteen years;‡ but the Pontifical allots to him eleven years only, and so doth the Breviary;§ both of them making him Diocletian's kinsman (which Eusebius knew nothing of): the notes out of Baronius contradict them all, and ascribe to him twelve years, making him Diocletian's nephew; and yet the Pontifical saith both that he fled from Diocletian's persecution, and died a confessor; yet was crowned with martyrdom with his brother Gabinius: which nonsense Baronius and the notes also defend.

§. 7. This century is concluded by the unfortunate Marcellinus, who, as the Pontifical tells us, did sacrifice to idols;|| and St. Augustine in the notes plainly supposes it to be true: yet the annotator (who dares not deny it) labours to amuse the reader, by saying this story may be plainly refuted and proved false by divers probable reasons out of Baronius; but because their Missals and Martyrology do own the thing, he will not go that way to work: what then? Doth he clearly charge the infallible judge with apostasy? No, he saith, "he seemed to deny the faith by external acts (that is, sacrificing to idols); yet by his internal acts (it seems Binius knew his thoughts), he did not believe any thing contrary to the faith:" and truly this is an early instance of Jesuitical equivocation: but we may make the same excuse for all the apostates in the world; and it is plain the notes care not what they say to protect their dear infallibility against the most convincing truths.

About the very time of this Pope's apostasy was held a

* Euseb. Hist. lib. 7. c. 26.

† Lab. p. 913. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 167. col. 2.

‡ Euseb. Hist. lib. 7. c. 26.

§ Brev. Roman. April. 22.

|| Lab. p. 930. [ut supra.] Bin 174. col. 2.

Council at Cirta in Africa ; and though St. Augustine, the author from whom they have all they know about it, say not one word of Marcellinus ; yet the editors and annotator both put in these words, that it was under Marcellinus :* where I cannot but wonder, that (since they have invented a Council in the same year to set poor Marcellinus right again after his apostasy) they did not place that Council first, and then their reconciled penitent might with a better grace have sat at Cirta, and condemned such as fell in the persecution.

But the most infamous forgery is the ridiculous Council of Sinuessa,† devised by some dull monk, who could write neither good sense nor true Latin, inspired only by a blind zeal for the Roman Church, whose infallible head must be cleared from apostasy, though it be by the absurdest fictions imaginable : for he feigns this apostate Pope met three hundred bishops near Sinuessa, in Diocletian's time, in a cave which would hold but fifty of them at once ; and their business was only to hear Marcellinus condemn himself, and to tell him he could be judged by none. The two first copies of this Council were so stuffed with barbarisms, false Latin and nonsense, and so contrary to each other, that somebody took pains out of both to devise a third copy, and, by changing and adding at pleasure, brought it at last to some tolerable sense. Surius and Binius print all three copies, but Labbé and the *Collectio regia* leave out the two originals, and only publish the third, dressed up by a late hand, which in time may pass for the true account of this Council. But the two first copies in Binius, yet extant, will give the reader a good proof into what depth of ignorance the monks were fallen, when such unintelligible and incoherent stuff as this, and the letters forged between the Council of Nice and Pope Sylvester (which are in the same style) were designed to support the Roman supremacy and infallibility. I shall not reflect upon the absurdity of making the Pope his own judge, when he denies the fact, nor the contradiction of the Councils, saying often, "they must not judge him ;" and yet declaring soon after, "that they have condemned him."‡ Whoever will but read this Council over, shall find diversion enough, if blunders and dulness be diverting to them. I shall therefore principally note the gross partiality and fallacies of the notes, in colouring

* Lab. p. 936. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 177. col. 1, 2.

† Lab. p. 938. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 178.

‡ Bin. p. 179, 180, et 183.

over this barefaced forgery. First, The annotator accuses the century writers and English innovators for rejecting this rare Council as a forgery of the Donatists, he should have said of the Romish monks; yet he makes more objections against it than he himself can answer. Protestants wonder that three hundred bishops should dare to meet in times of persecution; he replies, a far less number did meet on a slighter occasion fifty years before; which is but a very indifferent proof. Well, but to magnify the occasion he saith, "by this Pope's fall not only the Roman Church, but the whole Christian religion was in extreme danger; and in the president of the catholic faith, the very foundation of the Church was shaken and almost ruined." Yet a little before he had told us out of St. Augustine, that Marcellinus's fall did no prejudice to the Church; and had affirmed, "that the ill deeds of bishops may hurt themselves, but cannot prejudice the Church's orthodox doctrine."* Again, he proves it could not be an invention of the Donatists, because they never knew of it; yet presently he owns they objected it to the Catholics, and therefore must know of it, all that St. Augustine saith being only, "that they could not prove it." After this Baronius and he say, "that no writer doth mention this city of Sinuessa, nor is there any memory of such a place or cave:" which is a great mistake in them both. For Livy, Cicero, Ovid, Martial and Pliny, do all speak of Sinuessa,† and Alexander ab Alexandro mentions a famous highway leading from Rome to this city.‡ And if an earthquake have since overthrown it, that will not prove there was no such city then; all the wonder is, that these gentlemen should defend a Council for genuine, which they thought had been held in Utopia. The notes proceed to tell us, that "very many most learned men (not heretics I suppose), by very strong arguments, have laboured to prove these acts spurious: but he (who values no arguments against the supremacy) not only thinks them not to be false, but judges them worthy of great esteem for their venerable antiquity, and for their majesty, which extorts reverence even from the unwilling." Now their antiquity cannot be proved by one old author, and their majesty is so little, that they extort laughter and contempt from the gravest reader. Let us therefore hear his reason for this

* Bin. p. 175. col. 1, 2.

† Ferrari Lexic. Geograph. p. 199.

‡ Al. ab. Alexand. gen. diar. lib. 3. cap. 13.

approbation ; it is " because they are believed by general consent of all " (he forgets that he said but now, very many and very learned men did not believe them) : and because they are received and retained without any controversy to this day, in the martyrologies and breviaries of the Roman and other Churches : * so that at last, all the authority for this Council is the Roman Martyrology and Breviary ; which are modern collections out of the fabulous Pontifical, and other forged acts of martyrs : and though their own learned men, by good arguments prove the things to be false ; yet if they be read in a breviary, &c. these falsehoods become true, and Catholics receive them without controversy ; yea, they cite the transcript of a forgery to prove the original to be a truth. Again, the notes say, it is no prejudice to the truth of Marcellinus's fall, though the Africans did not know of it, nor St. Augustine, nor any of the African Church : yet in the next page it is observed, " that there are very many names of the witnesses which prove his fall," which are peculiar to the African Christians. Now if these names were peculiar to the Africans, then these witnesses were of the African Church originally, and then it is morally impossible, that they should never tell none of their countrymen of so famous a transaction. The notes confess that these acts often mention *Libra occidua* ; which is a word invented after the empire was divided into east and west : and thence the same notes infer, " these acts were not writ in those ancient times ; " yet they make it a wonder, that they were not seen in Africa in St. Augustine's time or before ; which is to wonder that they had not seen them in Africa before they were written. It puzzles the annotator to make out an excuse for that ridiculous falsehood in these acts, that Marcellinus was led into the temple of Vesta and Isis, and there sacrificed to Hercules, Jupiter and Saturn ; because these gods were never placed nor worshipped in the temples of those female deities : nor can he allow what the Acts say about this Council being held when Diocletian was in his Persian war ; for he affirms it was held two years after that war, when Diocletian had divested himself of the empire, and lived a private life : but then the acts made Diocletian to be present, and in Rome when Marcellinus did sacrifice ; and at this rate the Pope would have laid two years at least in the apostasy, which the annotator must not endure. To conclude,

* Brev. Roman. April. 26.

we now see, that a Council held nobody knows where nor when, concealed from all ancient authors, writ in later times, full of barbarisms and nonsense, falsehoods and contradictions, if it do but pretend to make out the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, and set him (while he was an apostate, and falsely denied the fact) above a Council of three hundred innocent bishops; if it do but say the Pope, though never so wicked, cannot be judged by any but himself: this Council shall be published by the Roman editors, and vindicated by partial notes, as if it were a most genuine and authentic truth. From whence it is plain, that these editors, and especially this annotator, hath no other measure of truth and falsehood but the interest of the Roman Church, which they resolve to promote, though it be by the most unjust means. And this may suffice to observe for the third century.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE ROMAN FORGERIES, IN THE VOLUMES OF THE COUNCILS, FOR THE FOURTH CENTURY.

PART II.—CHAPTER IV.

Of the Forgeries in the Fourth Century.

§ 1. THIS century* begins with the life of Marcellus, a Pope so obscure, that Eusebius's chronicle wholly omits him;† and Theodoret knew nothing of him, nor of Pope Eusebius, but makes Melchiades immediate successor to Marcellinus.‡ It is very observable, that these two unknown Popes, in the notes on their lives, are said to have sat seven years between them: and the Pontifical saith, there was a vacancy of seven years after Marcellinus; which vacancy is also asserted by Anastasius Biblioth. by Luitprandus, Abbo Floriacens. Cusanus, and Genebrard.§ And though Baronius's and Binius's notes deny this seven years' vacancy, it is upon mere conjectures. The scandal of so long a vacancy no doubt setting

* An. Dom. 304.

† Lab. tom. iii. p. 947. [p. 946. vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. tom. i. p. 185. col. 2.

‡ Theod. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 3.

§ Richer de Eccles. potestate, cap. 3. p. 46.

some of the old parasites of Rome on work to invent two Popes' names, and put them into the list; from whence probably they have been foisted into Optatus and St. Augustine, two Latin Fathers, while the Greek authors (which these forgers understood not) do continue uncorrupted: and truly nothing but the names of these two Popes remain; for no good historian mentions any one eminent act done by either of them; however, the annotator had rather fill up his scene with empty names of feigned Popes, who did nothing for seven years together, than let the reader suppose the Catholic Church could so long want its pretended head. But though the notes allow not the authority of the Pontifical for the vacancy, they trust it for the fictitious story of this Marcellus's life, and would have us believe, that in a time of persecution this Pope appointed twenty-five churches in Rome to baptize converts and bury martyrs in; and though the laws and customs of that city then forbade to bury dead bodies within the walls, we are to believe that the tyrant Maxentius (who made all these martyrs, and persecuted this very Pope) consented to his breaking this ancient law. On the credit of the same Pontifical we are told, that a certain lady called Lucina, dedicated her house to this Pope (while he was alive) by the title of St. Marcellus; and that the Emperor turned it into a stable, and made the Pope his beast keeper there, where naked and clothed with sackcloth (they are the words of the Pontifical), he soon after ended his days, the 17th of the Kalends of February.* Which fiction the Roman Breviary orders to be read to the credulous people of that communion for lessons; and tells them, that Marcellus writ an epistle to the bishops of the Antiochian province about the Roman primacy, and to prove Rome to be the head of all Churches, and that no Synod should be held without the Pope's authority. But this epistle† is owned by Labbé to be a forgery, patched up out of divers modern authors, citing the vulgar Latin version, and dated after Marcellus's death; and it is very strange, that times of persecution should be a proper season for a Pope to wrangle for his supremacy: yet this notorious forger saith, "Christ ordered St. Peter to translate his seat from Antioch to Rome; and that the Apostles by inspiration decreed, that all appeals should be made thither, and no Council held but by the authority of the Roman Church." For which cause Binus

* Breviar. Rom. Jan. 16. p. 674.

† Lab. p. 948, [ut supra.] Bin. p. 166. col. 1.

vindicates it with notes as full of falsehood as the epistle itself.* His first note of this epistle, being writ to one Solomon a bishop, is an oversight, and belongs to the first epistle of Pope Marcellinus.† His next notes about the primacy and power of calling Synods, cite an apostolical and Nicene canon for it; but no such canons are to be found. He quotes also two epistles, one writ to Pope Felix from Alexandria; another writ by Pope Julius to the Eastern Churches, for proof of this supremacy; and the same annotator afterwards owns them both to be forgeries.‡ He falsely saith, Dioscorus was condemned at Chalcedon, only for holding a Synod without the Pope's consent; whereas he is known to have been accused of many other crimes. His text of *Pasce oves*, is nothing to this purpose; nor will Pope Pelagius's word be taken in his own cause. His story of Valentinian makes nothing for the Pope, more than any other bishop; yea, the bishops desiring him to call a Council, shews, they thought it was his prerogative; and Nicephorus relates his answer to have been, "that he was so taken up with state affairs, that he had no leisure to inquire into those matters:"§ wherefore, after all this elaborate sophistry to justify a false assertion of a forged epistle, the annotator hath only shewed his partiality for the Pope's power, but made no proof of it.

The second epistle of this Marcellus (to the tyrant Maxentius) is also a manifest forgery;|| part of it is taken out of his successor Gregory's epistles, writ almost three hundred years after this; and it is highly improbable that a persecuted Pope should falsely, as well as ridiculously, to a pagan emperor, quote the laws of the Apostles and their successors, forbidding to persecute the Church and clergy; and also instruct him about the Roman Church's power in calling synods and receiving appeals; and cite Clement's forged epistle as an authority to Maxentius, that laymen must not accuse bishops. The notes indeed are unwilling to lose such precious evidence, and so pretend that Maxentius at this time dissembled himself to be a Christian; but this sham can signify nothing to such as read the epistle, where Marcellus complains that he then

* Lab. p. 950. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 187. col. 1.

† Bin. p. 175. col. 2. Baron. An. 296. §. 5.

‡ Bin. Not. in Epist. Fæl. p. 499. et Not. in Epist. Julii, p. 385.

§ Niceph. lib. 2. cap. 3. et Whitak. de Concil. p. 51.

|| Lab. p. 951. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 387. col. 1.

persecuted him most unjustly, and therefore he did not pretend to be a Christian at that time, and consequently the whole epistle is an absurd forgery : and so is that decree subjoined to it, which supposes young children offered to monasteries, and shaved or veiled there ; customs which came up divers centuries after this.

§. 2. The canons of Peter, bishop of Alexandria,* are genuine, and a better record of ecclesiastical discipline than any Pope to this time ever made ; the reader also may observe the bishop of Rome is not once named in these canons ; and they plead tradition for the Wednesday fast, contrary to the Roman Church's pretence, of having an apostolical tradition to fast on Saturday.

The Council of Elliberis, in Spain,† is by Binius placed under Pope Marcellus ; which words Labbé leaves out of the title,‡ and justly ; for if there were such a Pope, the Council takes no notice of him, nor is it likely that Rome did know of this Council till many years after. Yet it is both ancient and authentic, though Mendoza in Labbé§ reckons up divers catholic authors, Caranza, Canus, Baronius, &c. who either wholly reject it, or deny the 34th, 35th, 36th, and 40th canons of it, which condemn the opinions they held at Rome : and though Binius (because Pope Innocent approves it) dare not reject it ; yet he publishes notes to make the reader believe it doth not condemn any of their opinions or practices.

The 13th canon speaks of virgins who dedicated themselves to God ; but mentions not their being veiled or living in monasteries ; which customs came in long after, as the authors cited in the notes shew.||

The 26th canon calls it an error to fast upon Saturday : but the notes are so bold as to say the error which this Council corrected was not the fasting on Saturday : whereas even these very notes confess that the Eastern churches, and most of the Western (Rome and some few others excepted), together with the African church, did not fast on Saturday, but Wednesday ; yea, those they call the Apostolical Canons, and Clement's Constitutions do both establish Wednesday fast, and condemn their pretended Apostolical church's Saturday fast ; and if

* Lab. p. 967. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 189. col. 1.

† An. Dom. 305.

‡ Lab. p. 967. E. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 191. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 1030. [ut supra.]

|| Lab. p. 983. D. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 200. col. 1.

divers in Spain (as the notes say) in St. Jerome's and Pope Innocent's time did not fast on Saturday, and others then needed arguments to settle them in this Roman practice, it may be gathered from thence, that in the time of this Council the Saturday fast was esteemed an error, as it was also in that age almost in all Christian churches; and so the very words of the canon import, which Baronius saw, and therefore only saith,* there is mention of the Saturday fast in this synod; and so passes it, knowing it plainly contradicted the Roman Church's tradition.

The 34th canon (under plain of excommunication) forbids the lighting wax candles in the places where the martyrs were buried;† which agrees with the sentiments of the Primitive Church.‡ Lactantius condemns lighting candles in God's worship by day as a paganish superstition.§ St. Jerome saith it was used in his time only by such as did it to humour the silly vulgar, who had a zeal without knowledge.|| Yet the notes confess this is the custom of the Roman Church; for which only cause some of their doctors reject this canon (since nothing must be authentic which condemns their novel superstitions), and these notes make a miserable blunder to excuse the matter; but we are not concerned whether (with the annotator) these candles in the daylight disturb the spirits of the living saints, by seeing an heathenish rite brought into the Church, or (with Baronius) displease the saints deceased to behold so superstitious a thing vainly devised for their honour. Since it sufficiently appears the practice is novel and absurd, and (though now used at Rome) condemned by the best antiquity. The notes also give us one extraordinary distinction between the souls of deceased saints in heaven and those in purgatory;¶ which latter sort, if they had been saints, one would think should need no such dreadful scourging.

The 36th canon determines that pictures ought not to be in churches, and that none may paint upon walls that which is worshipped:** which so expressly condemns the Roman worship of pictures and images, that the boldest writers of that

* Baron. Annal. An. 305. §. 49. [ut supra, vol. 3. p. 406. col. 1.]

† Lab. p. 985. E. Bin p. 201. col. 1.

‡ Daillé, de Cultu Lat. lib. 2. c. 15.

§ Lactant. Instit. lib. 6. c. 2.

|| Heiron. ad Ripar. ep. 53.

¶ Bin. Not. in 34 et 35 Can. p. 201. col. 2.

** Lab. p. 986. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 201. col. 2.

Church reject this canon; but others (as the notes say) would gladly expound it so, as to assert the honour and worship due to holy images (which is a notable kind of exposition to make a canon assert that which it confutes). But such transparent fallacies deserve rather derision than serious arguments. Sanders and Turrian observe, that these Fathers forbid not images which Christians might take away and hide, but pictures which they must leave exposed to pagan abuses. But might not this have been prevented by hanging up their pictures in frames? and are not large images as difficult to be removed and concealed as pictures? Yea, doth not the present Roman Church adore pictures as well as images? so that still this canon condemns them. Martinez fancies this Council forbade painting on the walls, lest the pictures should be deformed by the decay of those walls: but he forgets that the Council first forbids them to be any where in the Church; and were not walls as subject to decay in the time of the second Nicene Council as they are now? And had not those Fathers as great an honour for pictures as these at Elliberis? Yet the Nicene picture-worshippers order them to be painted on church walls. Martinez adds, "that as times vary, human statutes vary; and so the second Council of Nice made a quite contrary decree." What! are decrees of Councils about matters of divine worship only human statutes? What will become of the divine authority and apostolical tradition pretended for this worship of old at Nice, and now at Rome, if the orders against it and for it be both human and mutable statutes? It is well, however, that the patrons of image-worship do own they have altered and abrogated a primitive canon for one made four hundred years after, in times of ignorance and superstition; and we know whether of the two we ought to prefer. Baronius is more ingenuous, who saith,* "these bishops at Elliberis chiefly endeavoured, by strict penalties, to affright the faithful from idolatry, wherefore they made the 34th, 36th, and 37th canons; and by comparing the first canon with the forty-sixth, it appears they dealt more severely with an idolater than an apostate." From whence we infer, that pictures in churches tend to idolatry in this Council's opinion. Albaspinæus (whose notes Labbé here prints)† would enervate this canon, by saying "it forbids not the saints'

* Baron. An. 305. §. 45. [ut supra, p. 405. col. 1.]

† Lab. p. 998.

pictures, but those which represented God and the holy Trinity." But it is not probable these primitive Christians were so ignorant as to need any prohibition about such blasphemous representations of God's majesty. And he brings no proof but his own bare conjecture for this limitation of the canon; which fancy (if it were true) would prove, that the saints were not worshipped or adored in that age, because nothing that was worshipped and adored was to be painted on the walls; and if that be meant only of God and the Trinity, then nothing else but God and the Trinity was adored in those days. Finally, the former part of the canon destroys this limitation, by excluding pictures in general out of churches. These are the various fallacies by which these partial editors would hide the manifest novelty of their Church's worship of pictures, which cannot be defended by all these tricks.

I will only add, that this genuine ancient Council in the fifty-third canon, orders, the same bishop who excommunicated a man to absolve him; and that if any other intermeddled, he should be called to an account for it;* without excepting the Pope, or taking notice of Marcellus's pretended claim of appeals.

§. 3. In the year 306, was a Council at Carthage against the Donatists, which never takes any notice of the Pope; yet they put into the title of it, under Marcellus.† But there is a worse forgery in the notes, where St. Augustine is cited, as saying, "that Cecilian, bishop of Carthage, despised the censures of the Donatists, because he was joined in communion with the bishop of the Roman Church; from which all catholic communion was ever wont to be denominated." But this is Baronius's false gloss, not St. Augustine's words, who only saith,—"because he was united by communicatory letters, both to the Roman Church, wherein the principality of the catholic Church had always flourished, and to other lands from whence the Gospel came to Africa."‡ Now there is great difference between a man's being a Catholic, because he was in communion with Rome (then orthodox) and with other Churches; and his being a Catholic merely for being in communion with the Roman Bishop, which is the modern and false notion of the word Catholic among Papists, in our days. But

* Lab. p. 976. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 196. C.

† Lab. p. 1379. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 202. C.

‡ Aug. ep. 62. tom. ii. p. 150. Vid. Baron. An. 306. §. 40. [ut supra, p. 427. col. 1.]

Binius was so convinced that St. Augustine's words confuted Baronius's paraphrase, that he cunningly leaves them out to make this commodious sense of them go better down with careless readers.

§. 4. The next Pope Eusebius was so obscure (as the notes in his life declare) that no writer mentions any thing of him that is memorable;* and it is probable there never was such a Pope: yet the Pontifical saith, the cross was found in his time upon the fifth of the Nones of May, which is the very day on which the Roman Church now celebrates the Invention of the Cross: and the third decretal epistle of this Pope was devised on purpose to support this story; yet both Baronius and Binius reject it for a fable, even while their Church still observes that holiday. There are three epistles forged for this name of the Pope, all which Labbé owns to be spurious;† and I need not spend much time to prove it, since they cite the vulgar Latin version, and are mostly stolen out of modern authors (as Labbé's margin shews), having only one consul's name for their dates, because no other was named in the Pontifical. Besides, the first epistle uses the phrase, *Pro salvatione servorum Dei*, which is not the Latin of that age; and talks of rigorous tortures used among Christians, to make witnesses confess truth. The second epistle repeats the foolish argument, of Christ's whipping the buyers and sellers (many of which were laymen) out of the temple, to prove, that God alone must judge priests; and out of a much later Council (suspected also of forgery), speaks of the people's not judging their bishop, unless he err in matters of faith;—and discourses of edicts of kings, forbidding to try an ejected bishop, till he be restored to his place. The third epistle hath the fable of the invention of the cross, and all other marks of forgery on it; yet Bellarmine cites it to prove, the Pope's succession to St. Peter, in his universal monarchy; and to make out confirmation to be a sacrament.‡ So little do those writers value the credit of any evidence, if it do but make for their Church's authority, or support its doctrines.

§. 5. The seven years' vacancy being now expired, Melchisedes was chosen Pope, and sat three years and seven months, according to the Pontifical;§ and though the ecclesiastical

* Lab. p. 1380. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 203. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 1381. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 203. col. 1.

‡ Bellarm. de Pontif. Rom. lib. 2. cap. 14. et de Confirm. lib. 2. cap. 3.

§ Lab. p. 1394. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 209. col. 1.

tables (as they call them) generally follow this author; yet Baronius here by them corrects the Pontifical, and allows Melchiades only two years and two months. But all this is conjecture, for he grants the consuls in the Pontifical are so false, that they cannot be reconciled to truth:* whence it follows, that the decretal epistle ascribed to this Pope, whose matter is taken from the Pontifical, and whose date is not till after Melchiades' death, must be false also:† yet the notes defend this forged epistle, and Bellarmine cites it for the supremacy, and for confirmation's being a sacrament;‡ whereas the beginning of it is stolen out of Celestine's epistle to the French;§ it quotes the vulgar translation, and cites an apostolical privilege granted to Rome for the sole right of trying bishops: to justify which, the notes cite the 73rd and 74th Apostolical Canons; but those Canons order bishops to judge an offending bishop, and make the last appeal to a Synod, without taking any notice of Rome, or of this pretended privilege. Again, this feigned epistle impudently makes confirmation more venerable than baptism; and the notes defend that bold expression. But we cannot but wonder (since they assert, that bishops by God's law, have the sole power of confirming), the same men should grant, that the Pope can give a priest leave to confirm: which yet (they say) changes not the divine right of bishops;|| that is in plain terms, one man's sole right may be delegated to another by a third person, without any injury to him who had the sole right.

After this follows a Council at Rome under Melchiades, wherein the Pope, by delegation from the emperor, is joined in commission with three French bishops (who are called his colleagues) to hear the Donatists' complaint against Cecilian, bishop of Carthage;¶ and Constantine not only received the Donatists' first appeal, and delegated his cause to Melchiades and his fellow commissioners; but, upon a second complaint, ordered this matter to be heard over again in a French Council, which the Pope in Council had determined. Now this so clearly shews, that the Pope was not supreme judge in those days, that Baronius and Binius are hard put to it to blunder this instance: the notes say, "Constantine was yet raw in the

* Baron. An. 311. §. 43. [ut p. 492. col. 2.]

† Lab. p. 1400. A. in margin. [ut supra.]

‡ Bellarmin. ubi supra. § Lab. p. 1395. D. E. [ut supra.]

|| Lab. p. 1400. E. Bin. p. 211. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 1401. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 212. col. 1.

faith ;” and yet they say also, “ he knew by God’s law nothing was to be done without the chief bishop.” But they are forced to prove this by a false translation of Constantine’s epistle to Melchhiades,* the words of which in Greek are, *Τῷ σεβασμιωτάτῳ νόμῳ ἀμύρρειν*, which in their version is, “ as the most holy law of God requires ;” but Valesius’s translation (which Labbé gives us) is, “ as agreeable to the most venerable law :” that is (as all men know) to the imperial laws : so that Constantine only says, he had ordered the accusers and accused all to appear at Rome before these delegated judges, as the venerable laws (which order both parties to be present when a cause is tried) do require ; and by the help of a false translation this occasion is made use of to make the credulous believe, that God’s law required all causes should be tried at Rome : whereas it is apparent by this instance, that a cause once tried there before the Pope, might be tried over again in France, if the Emperor pleased.

The two following epistles of Constantine, out of Pithæus’s manuscript,† are very suspicious ; the first speak more magnificently of Christ than one who (as they say) was so raw in the faith was like to do : and in it Constantine is made to decline judging in bishops’ causes ; which is a protestation against his own act, and a contradiction to the second epistle ; wherein he declares, “ that this episcopal cause shall be tried before himself.” Nor is this first epistle recorded in Eusebius, or agreeable to Constantine’s style ; so that we suppose that was devised by such as designed to persuade princes, that bishops were above them : for which purpose Baronius here cites a law of this Emperor to Ablavius,‡ “ giving men leave to choose bishops for their judges, and not allow them after that to appeal to secular courts ; because they had been heard by judges of their own choosing :” but Baronius perverts this, to signify, that bishops were above secular judges by their ordinary jurisdiction ; whereas they were not so in any cause of this kind, but only when they were extraordinarily chosen arbitrators ; and so Sozomen expounds this law.

§. 6. We are now arrived at the time of Pope Sylvester,§ who living about the time when Constantine publicly professed

* Lab. p. 1407. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 212. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 1430. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 213.

‡ Baron. An. §14. §. 38, 39. [ut supra, p. 572, 573.]

§ An. Dom 314.

Christianity, and being Pope when the Nicene Council was called; yet no author of credit records his being much concerned in these grand revolutions. Upon which the annalist and our editors rake into all kind of forgeries, and devise most improbable stories, to set off Pope Sylvester as very considerable; but we shall look into the original of the Emperor's becoming a Christian, which will discover all their fallacies.

Constantine was born of Christian parents, and brought up under them, and was thirty years old when he entered on the empire: and from the year 306,* he professed openly he was a Christian, making laws to encourage converts, and to suppress Paganism throughout his empire, building and endowing churches, and granting great immunities to the clergy; yet all this while he took no notice of Marcellus, Eusebius or Melchisedes, St. Peter's successors, and pretended monarchs of the Church. After seven years having vanquished Maxentius at Rome, they say, he gave to the Pope his palace of the Lateran.† The notes cite Optatus for this; but he only saith, "a Council of nineteen bishops met in the Lateran:" but it doth not follow from thence, that Constantine had then given the Pope this fair palace. Again, Baronius (without any ancient author for it) saith, "that Constantine gave St. Peter thanks for his victory over Maxentius;" yet at the same time he affirms, "he was yet a Pagan, and durst not by his acts declare himself a Christian."‡ Very strange! Were not building churches, settling Christianity by a law, giving his palace to the Pope, and (as they say) fixing the trophy of the cross in the midst of Rome,§ acts sufficient to declare him a Christian? No, he must be a Pagan eleven years after this, and a persecutor; yea, in the year 324, he was so mere a heathen as to know nothing of the Christian rites, but what an Egyptian taught him. After he had openly professed his religion eighteen years, he had forgot it all, and turned so great a tyrant, that Pope Sylvester (who had no great mind to be a martyr), ran away into the Mount Soracte, or was banished thither. But Constantine, after he had been ten years Pope, never had heard of him, till being struck with a leprosy (mentioned in no authentic writer), two glorious persons, whose faces he

* Baron. An. 306. §. 14. [Ibid. p. 410. col. 2.]

† Lab. p. 1394. Bin. p. 209. col. 1. Baron. An. 312. §. 82. et 85. [Ibid. p. 526, 527.]

‡ Baron. An. 312. §. 58, et 62. [Ibid. p. 517, 518.]

§ Bin. p. 298. col. 2.

knew not, appeared to the Emperor, and ordered him to send for Pope Sylvester to cure him; who (when he was come) first shewed Constantine these two glorious persons were St. Peter and St. Paul, and then cured him; made him a Christian, and baptized him. Which idle and self-contradicting romance is magnified by Baronius's and Binus's notes; but we will now confute it as briefly as we can.

§. 7. First, This whole story is devised to exalt the glory of the Roman Church; to make men believe the Pope could work miracles, and that the first Christian Emperor was baptized at Rome: but then it casts such a blot upon Constantine's memory, and feigns such odious and incredible things of him, as no wise man can believe concerning a prince, who St. Augustine saith, was a Christian eight years before this.* And whoever reads in Baronius the history of the first ten years of Sylvester, from A.D. 314 till 324, and observes what glorious things he saith of Constantine's religious laws, his piety to God, his zeal for Christianity, his respect to confessors, and his bounty to bishops; his taking part with the catholics against heretics and schismatics; he can never believe this scandalous story of so excellent a prince. But in all this period of time, Baronius himself cannot find one evidence, that ever Constantine had any correspondence with Sylvester; and therefore Christianity was settled in the empire without the Pope's help. To cover which great truth, some dull but zealous monk long since invented this sham story, to save the credit of Rome; and the annalist and these notes strive to defend it.

Secondly, This fable chiefly relies on the credit of the Pontifical (so often proved false), and upon the repute of Sylvester's acts: but the annotator at first ominously charges them both with falsehood; † the former mistakes the time of the vacancy, and the latter (he saith) is wrong in making Melchiades ordain Sylvester a priest, he being ordained by Marcellinus long before. Baronius also confesseth, that "these acts of Sylvester are so false in many particulars, that it shakes the credit of the whole." ‡ But it is very strange, after he (who is so concerned for their reputation) had found so many flaws in them, he should justify them even where they contradict all the historians of the age; which can spring from nothing but a resolu-

* Baron. An. 315. §. 59, et 62, 63. [Ibid. p. 619, 620.]

† Lab. p. 1416. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 217. col. 1.

‡ Baron. Annal. 311. §. 59. [Ibid. p. 497.] et An. 315. §. 10, 11, et 12. [Ibid. p. 594.] et An. 324. §. 41. [Ibid. vol. 4. p. 43, 44.]

tion to maintain every thing which made for the credit of the Roman see.

Thirdly, The notes say not only the acts of Sylvester, but Zosimus and Sozomen do both attest this story. Now Zosimus was a Pagan, and Baronius and Binius confess, he tells many malicious lies of Constantine, for suppressing the heathen religion; and though they confute the rest of his calumnies, they defend his relation of Constantine's baptism, as sounding something like those forged acts;* and though his account of it reflect as much upon Constantine as is possible, yet the annalist and annotator labour to prove this spiteful heathen to be a truer historian than Sozomen, Socrates, or Eusebius, whom they represent as liars and flatterers, not to be believed against Zosimus. Yet there is a mighty difference between this Pagan's history of the baptism of Constantine, and that in Sylvester's acts. Zosimus saith, it was a Spaniard named Ægyptius, lately by the court ladies brought acquainted with Constantine, who advised him to be baptized; and this the notes say was Hosius: yet it is plain Hosius was Constantine's intimate friend, and his legate into Egypt twelve years before.† Besides, Zosimus doth not name Sylvester, and only designed by his relation to blacken Constantine, and represent Christianity as a sanctuary for villainies, which could not be expiated among the Pagans: but the acts discourse of a persecution and a leprosy, and make Peter and Paul the advisers of Constantine's baptism; and their business is only to set up Sylvester's name. And the stories (like all falsehoods) do not hang together. As for Sozomen, he is no evidence for Sylvester's acts, nor doth he once name that Pope in the place cited.‡ He only confutes the scandalous stories which Zosimus had falsely told of Constantine, shewing how improbable it is, that this emperor (after he had reigned nigh twenty years) should need a new conversion; and how unlikely it must be that the Pagans would not have found out some rites to expiate him, that so they might secure him in their religion: so that he is a witness that these reports of Constantine were false, and invented by malicious heathens, and so far as Zosimus and Sylvester's acts agree, he confutes them both; and since he lived within an hundred years after this time, while some alive might possibly remember these passages, his early denial of

* Baron. An. 324. §. 17. [Ibid. p. 35.]

† Baron. An. 312. §. 91. [Ibid. vol. 3. p. 529. col. 2.]

‡ Sozom. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 5.

these fictions is better evidence against them, than Baronius and Binius's testimony for them, after thirteen hundred years; to serve a turn, and do honour to that Church they resolve to magnify.

Fourthly, The notes speak of Sylvester's returning to Rome in great glory; which is not mentioned in Zosimus nor Sozomen, and only relies on the credit of these acts:* which have no evidence to attest them but Pope Adrian, who perhaps forged them; or, however, first produced these acts in the second Nicene Council four hundred and fifty years after Sylvester's time, to prove the use of images in Constantine's days. But the very acts declare, that Constantine (who had built and adorned so many churches, and if images or pictures had then been used, must have seen the faces of St. Peter and St. Paul) did not know the faces of these two great Apostles, till Sylvester shewed him their images. Whence we infer, that the acts are no good proof for images, if they were authentic; and their being first cited in an ignorant Council, made up of forgeries and false stories, gives us good reason to believe them spurious.

§. 8. The annotator in the next place asserts confidently, that Constantine was baptized at Rome by Sylvester, A. D. 324.† But his proofs are very weak, viz. First, He cites a Roman Council for this, held the same year; but the style of that Council is so barbarous, the sentences so incoherent, and the matter of fact so false, that Labbé owns it is a forgery, and Binius confesses it is suspicious; so that this can be no evidence.‡ Nor, secondly, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who lived five hundred and fifty years after this time, and was a mere sycophant of the Popes, to set up whose supremacy (then newly hatched) he stuck at nothing, and that spoils his credit. Thirdly, Zosimus is a malicious lying writer as to Constantine; and though he do say Constantine was baptized at Rome, he doth not affirm that Sylvester baptized him. Fourthly, Sozomen only relates Zosimus's story to confute it; so that not one of his witnesses do prove the matter: yet these authors, with a weak conjecture, that Constantine could not have been present in the Nicene Council, if he had not been baptized before (which we will presently confute), is all the evidence that Baronius and these notes can give for this incredible

* Lab. p. 1417. [vol. 1. Lat. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 217.

† Lab. p. 1417: [ut supra.] Bin. p. 217. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 1544. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 256.

story: but on the other side, there are many clear proofs, that he was baptized at Nicomedia, a little before his death.

First, Eusebius (who lived at that time, and knew Constantine very well, and writ his history soon after) doth affirm this; and if it had been false, many then alive, who could remember it, would doubtless have exposed him for so manifest a fiction. The notes say he forged this story in favour of Constantius; but he must be very ridiculous, if he would be obliged by a story of his father, which many hundreds, as well as himself, must have then known to be a falsehood: and Eusebius must be as silly as he was knavish, to invent a fable so easy to be disproved by living witnesses. But the notes wrong Eusebius, when they say he reports that Constantine died impious and alienated from the catholic Church; for Eusebius saith, he made a most Christian and pious end. However, Eusebius by this testimony brings upon himself all the rage and spite of Baronius and our annotator, who upon all occasions blast this holy and learned writer, to whose pains they and all the Christian world are infinitely beholden; and though while Eusebius's history continues, it be almost the only true record used by Baronius in compiling his Annals; yet he and Binius in every page almost do revile him as an Arian and a writer of lies. But there is so much malice, and so little probability in the accusation, that their own writers and ours also do vindicate Eusebius from these slanders;* and we could easily confute these calumnies, but only that in this relation he is so certainly in the right, that we need not consider his opinion in other things, but will shew, as to this particular, he is supported by the best evidence imaginable. For,

Secondly, Theodoret also saith, that Constantine was baptized a little before his death at Nicomedia;† and though that Eusebius, who was bishop of that city, was an Arian, yet he dissembled his heresy while Constantine lived, and the emperor had restored Athanasius contrary to this bishop's mind; wherefore though he was forced to make use of an Arian bishop to baptize him, being taken ill in that city, yet it will not follow that Constantine died an Arian. Moreover, that Constantine was baptized at Nicomedia, is attested also by Socrates‡ and Sozomen;§ and also by the chronicles of Isidore and St.

* Valesii, præf. ad edit. Euseb. Dr. Cave's Life of Euseb. p. 31.

† Theodoret. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 32.

‡ Socrat. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 26.

§ Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 32.

Jerome,* and by St. Ambrose in his funeral oration for Theodosius; yea, Athanasius and a whole Synod at Ariminum, do expressly declare, that Constantine was baptized a little before his death; that is, thirteen years after this pretended baptism at Rome;† which last testimony Baronius and the notes presume to corrupt, and, contrary to all the best copies, and the necessary sense of the place, put Constans's name into the text, instead of Constantine: so that, in fine, the only question is now, whether we will believe these two modern partial writers, with those most fabulous (but as they call them most approved) acts of Sylvester, first cited by Pope Adrian 450 years after: or we will believe the concurrent witness of all the ancient and eminent writers of that and the next ages; to whom, if we give credit, then Constantine's baptism at Rome by Sylvester is a mere forgery, devised for the glory of the Roman Church, and for that only reason so eagerly defended by this Annotator and the Annalist.

§. 9. Together with this fable we must also reject the fiction of Constantine's leprosy, which was invented only that Sylvester might cure it;‡ and therefore the notes prove it very slenderly: *viz.* First, By those acts of Sylvester, in which they confess there are many errors.§ Secondly, By a Roman Council, which is as manifest a forgery as the acts themselves. Thirdly, By a metaphorical expression of Gregorius Turonensis, a credulous writer, who lived 300 years after this; and yet even he doth not expressly affirm it. Fourthly, But the annotator tells us the Gentile historians do confirm this, though he names but one, *viz.* Michael Glycas, who unluckily proves a Christian monk, living in Sicily A. D. 1120, about 800 years after this time, and long after Adrian and his Nicene Council had dispersed Sylvester's acts, out of which Glycas took this fable upon trust. So that at last he only proves the acts by the acts themselves and by Pope Adrian; and that is all the authority he hath for this feigned leprosy; which disease no writer (of credit and antiquity) saith Constantine ever had, no not that malicious Zosimus, who raked up all the odious things against this emperor he could devise; and if ever he had been

* Baron. An. 324. §. 47. [ut supra, vol. 4. p. 46. col. 1.]

† Athanas. de Synod. p. 243. Epistol. Synod. Arim. ap. Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 29. et Sozom. lib. 4. cap. 17.

‡ Lab. p. 1419. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 218. col. 2.

§ Vid. ibid. et Baron. Annal. 324. §. 97. [ut supra, p. 61.]

struck by Heaven with leprosy, no doubt he would have blazed it abroad with great pleasure.

§. 10. The book of Constantine's munificence is grounded on the fable of his baptism, and seems to be forged by the same hand with Sylvester's acts: so that we ought also to reject it as a fiction. Anastasius, who put it out, was the Pope's library-keeper; and whether he made it, or found it in the Vatican, that shop of lies (as Richerius calls it), the credit of it is invalidated, by reason no author of repute or antiquity mentions any of these gifts. It says blasphemously, "Constantine gave a Saviour sitting five feet high," (so he calls a dead image;*) but if this were true, why did not Adrian cite this in his Nicene Council? or why did this Emperor's sister write to Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, for an image of Christ, when Sylvester could more easily have furnished her? And by the way, the notes fraudulently mention this message,† but do not relate how severely Eusebius reproved that lady for seeking after a visible image of Christ. The annotator also cites Paulinus to prove this book of munificence; but he writ near one hundred years after; and though he speaks of a fine church of St. Peter in Rome, yet he saith not that Constantine either founded or adorned it. Baronius attempts to prove this book by mere conjectures, by the forged acts, and by Nicephorus, a late author, whom he often taxes for fictions:‡ but he can produce no ancient or eminent author for it. And yet it is certain, if Constantine had given so many and so great gifts to the head city of the world, some of the most famous writers would have recorded it. Besides, the Cardinal himself rejects both the idle story of St. Agnes's temple (attested by a fiction ascribed to St. Ambrose), told in this very book;§ and the apparent falsehood of Constantine's now burying his mother in one of these churches, who was alive long after.|| So that by his own confession there are divers falsehoods in this book; and he had been more ingenuous, if he had owned the whole to be (as it really is) a forgery.

§. 11. The editors now go back to the Council of Arles, held (as they say) A.D. 314:¶ and it troubles them much to

* Lab. p. 1420. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. Not. p. 219. col. 1.

† Not. Y. Bin. p. 219. col. 2. et Lab. p. 1421.

‡ Baron. Ann. 324. §. 72, et 75. [Ibid. p. 54, 55.]

§ Baron. An. 324. §. 107. [Ibid. p. 64. col. 2.]

|| Idem, Ann. 324. §. 114. [§. 115.] [ibid. p. 68.]

¶ Lab. p. 1425. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 220. col. 1.

ward off the blows which it gives to their beloved supremacy ; for it was appointed by the Emperor, upon an appeal made to him by the Donatists, to judge a cause over again, which had been judged before by Melchiades and his Roman Council, (the Pope in Council, it seems, being not then taken to be infallible). It is true, in the title which these editors give us, this Council directs their canons, "To their Lord and most holy Brother Sylvester the Bishop," and say, "they had sent them to him, that all might know (the Pope not excepted) what they were to observe." So that though in respect they call him Lord, yet they style him also a Brother, and expect his obedience to their decrees ; nor do they (as the notes pretend) desire him to confirm these canons ;* but only require the Pope, who held the larger diocese, that he would openly acquaint all with them, as their letter speaks. That is, as he was a metropolitan, to give notice of these canons to all his province, which was then called a diocese ; and Baronius is forced to point the sentence falsely, to make it sound toward his beloved supremacy.† So in the first canon Pope Sylvester is ordered by this Council to give notice to all of the day on which Easter was to be observed ; that is, he was to write to all his neighbouring bishops under his jurisdiction about it ; not as the notes say : "that he was to determine the day, and by virtue of his office, to write to all the bishops of the Christian world to observe it."‡ The Council had ordered the day, and commanded the Pope to give notice to all about him to keep it. And in the famous Nicene Council, the Bishop of Alexandria (living where astronomy was well understood) was appointed first to settle, and then to certify the day of Easter ; yet none will infer from hence, that he was the head of the catholic Church, because he had this duty imposed on him, which as yet is more than the Council of Arles did put upon the Bishop of Rome. Again, the notes are very angry at the Emperor for receiving the Donatists' appeal from the Pope and his Council, which they say Constantine owned to be an unjust and impious thing ;§ but they prove this only by a forged epistle mentioned but now, §. 5. But it is certain Constantine (though a catechumen, which they pretended was impossible at Nice) was

* Lab. p. 1434. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 225. col. 2.

† Baron. An. 314. §. 68. [Ibid. p. 583. col. 1.]

‡ Lab. p. 1434. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 224. col. 1. Baron. An. 314. §. 58. [Ibid. vol. 3. p. 580.]

§ Not. in Concil. Arel. Bin. p. 221. col. 2.

present in this Council, and so he must act against his conscience, if he had thought it unjust and impious to judge in ecclesiastical causes: and in this Emperor's letter to Ablavius, he saith, "God had committed all earthly things to his ordering;" and in that to Celsus he promises "to come into Africa, to inquire and judge of things done both by the people and the clergy."* And, indeed, Constantine, by all his practice, sufficiently declared, he thought it lawful enough for him to judge in ecclesiastical matters. Finally, the notes say the bishops met in this Council at the Emperor's request.† Now that shews that it was not at the Pope's request; but, indeed, Constantine's letter to Chrestus expressly commands the bishops to meet. The notes also out of Balduinus or Optatus (or rather from an obscure fragment cited by him) say, "Sylvester was president of this Council:"‡ Baroni-
us addeth of his own head — "namely by his legates;"§ which guess Binius puts down for a certain truth. But it is ridiculous to fancy that a pair of priests and as many deacons in that age should sit above the Emperor, when himself was present in that Council: so that though we allow the Pope's messengers to have been at this Council, there is no proof that they presided in it. We shall only add, that instead of Arians, in the eighth canon, we must read Africans; or else we must not fix this Council so early as A.D. 314; at which time the Arians were not known by that name.

§. 12. In the same year is placed the Council of Ancyra, which the editors do not (as usually) say was *under* Sylvester, but only *in his time*;§ and it is well they are so modest, for doubtless he had no hand in it. The notes confess, "that it was called by the authority of Vitalis, bishop of Antioch."|| Balsamon and Zonaras say "Vitalis of Antioch, Agricolaus of Cæsarea, and Basil of Amasea, were the presidents of it."¶ Yet not only Leo IV., but the famous Council of Nice, approved of this Synod called and carried on without the Pope's knowledge or leave. There is but one canon in this Council, which contradicts the Roman practice, *viz.* the ninth, which "allows deacons to marry and continue in their office, if they

* Baron. Ann. 316. §. 62. [Ibid. p. 620.]

† Lab. p. 1423. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 222. col. 2.

‡ Baron. Ann. 314. §. 51. [Ibid. p. 577. col. 2.]

§ Lab. p. 1455. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 225.

|| Lab. p. 1478. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 232. col. 2.

¶ Beveridg. Concil. tom. 1. p. 375.

declared at their ordination that they could not live single." This canon, therefore, Baronius and Binius strive to corrupt with false glosses. The former saith, "We may by this canon see how firmly ministers' single life was asserted, not only in the whole catholic Church, but in the East."* Now it is very strange, that a private canon of a provincial Council, which allows one order of ministers to marry, should shew it was the opinion of the whole Church that none might marry; the latter in his notes affirms that, "this among other canons solidly proves, that not only priests but deacons (by the apostolical law) were bound to live without wives."† But the Apostles certainly allowed deacons to have wives; and this canon was made on purpose that they might live with their wives if they pleased. The notes proceed to say, "that deacons ordained against their will, and protesting they could not contain, were by these Fathers permitted to marry after their ordination, provided they left off all sacred administrations, and did not communicate among the priests in the chancel, but among the people." Which is an impudent falsification; there being no word of being ordained unwillingly, nor any reason why they should be ordained, who were to be reduced to lay-communication. Yea, the words of the canon are express, "that if they did marry they should continue in their ministration."‡ So that these editors make no conscience to make these ancient records to contradict themselves, rather than let them seem to oppose their Church's present practice: for which vile purpose there is another trick in the notes on this Council; for whereas the eighteenth canon speaks of lay-persons which vowed single life (as many had done in times of persecution), and afterwards broke their vow, that these were to be counted bigamists; the notes§ on this canon put these words of the thirteenth canon, "those who are of the clergy," &c. before their observation on the eighteenth canon, on purpose to make the reader think the clergy in those days vowed single life, as they do now at Rome.

§. 13. The Council of Neocæsarea (according to these editors) was *under* Sylvester,|| who is not once named in it, nor doth it appear he knew of it. They might also have left

* Baron. An. 314. §. 88. [Ibid. p. 588.]

† Lab. p. 1478. [ut supra.] Bin p. 223. col. 2.

‡ Γαμήσαντες ἔστωσαν ἐν τῇ ὑπερησία. Vid. Bever. not. tom. 2. p. 175.

§ Bin. p. 233. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 1479. Bin. p. 233.

out Leo IV.'s approving it five hundred years after, because the notes say, "the Council of Nice allowed it, which is much more for its credit."* The same notes say, "the first canon orders the same thing which was decreed in the thirty-third canon at Elliberis, and the ninth at Ancyra." And if so, that is not (as they falsely gloss the canon of Ancyra), "that the clergy should live singly, or be reduced to lay-communion." For in that canon some of the clergy are allowed to marry, and to continue to minister as clergymen still. And the true sense of this Neocæsarean canon is, that whereas in times of persecution, when marriage was inconvenient, many priests promised to live single. Now these only were not allowed to marry afterward;† but when the Church had peace, the Nicene Council left all clergymen free to marry or not as they pleased; which shews, that when the reason of this canon ceased, they believed its obligations did so also. The fifth canon forbids a catechumen, who falls into sin, to enter into the church: by which the notes say, that Baronius had sharply censured Eusebius.‡ But it is plain that Baronius shews more malice than wit in that censure. Eusebius only relates matter of fact; that Constantine was present in the Nicene Council, and he (with all ancient authors) agrees, that Constantine was yet a catechumen; where then is the crime? Do not Baronius and Binius both agree, that Constantine was present in the Council of Arles, ten years before his pretended baptism at Rome? And if it be said, this canon forbade it; I ask, whether it be proper that an emperor (who, as Baronius saith, was *solutus legibus*, above the civil law) should be proceeded against by a canon of a small provincial Council? Wherefore Eusebius's only crime is, that he tells a truth, which happens to contradict the lying acts of Sylvester, and consequently the interest of Rome; for which the cardinal and annotator can never forgive him.

The next place is assigned to a Roman Council under Sylvester, wherein there was a famous disputation between the Jews and Christians before Constantine and Helena; but in the notes§ we are told the story is utterly false, only attested by Sylvester's acts, which "swarm with lies," as they are now

* Lab. p. 1489. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 236. col. 2.

† Vid. Beveridg. Not. in Concil. Nicen. tom. 2. p. 180.

‡ Vid. Baron. An. 324. §. 49. [ut supra, vol. 4. p. 46, 47.]

§ Lab. p. 1491. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 237. col. 1. Vid. Baron. An. 315, §. 12. [Ibid. vol. 3. p. 594. col. 2.]

extant (yet out of these acts, as now extant, is the forgery of Constantine's baptism at Rome taken), and therefore Baronius and Binius reject this Council as a mere forgery. But why do they not reject Constantine's baptism as well as this Council, since both rely on the same author? The reason is plain, that makes for the interest of the Pope, and this no way concerns it; and so it may pass for a forgery as it is.

§. 14. On occasion of Arius's heresy now breaking out at Alexandria,* there was a Council of an hundred bishops called by Alexander, bishop of that city, to condemn him; which first Council of Alexandria (the editors say) was under Sylvester; but it doth not appear that this Pope knew of it till three years after, A.D. 318;† at which time Alexander gave notice of this Council (not to Sylvester by name, as the notes falsely suggest), but to all catholic bishops, and in particular to the bishop of Constantinople. But for fear the reader should observe that more respect was shewn to that bishop than to the Pope, the editors have removed these epistles of Alexander into the body of the Nicene Council, and only give us notes upon them here; in which the annotator out of Baronius turns the charge of lying and forgery, of which themselves have been so often convicted, upon us, whom they falsely call innovators.‡ Four years after followed a second Council at Alexandria, which the notes hope to prove was under Sylvester,§ because Athanasius saith this was a General Council, and saith Hosius was there. Upon this Baronius, fancying nothing could be a General Council unless the Pope were present personally or by his legates, conjectures Hosius was the Pope's legate, and in that capacity presided in that Council:¶ and the notes positively affirm this dream for a certain truth. But Athanasius calls many Synods general, which were only provincial; and it is plain he had not the modern Roman notion of a General Council, because he never mentions Sylvester, nor doth he say Hosius was his legate. But even Baronius owns that Hosius was Constantine's intimate friend, and his legate into Egypt six years before;¶ and Socrates saith he was now again sent thither as the Emperor's legate;

* An. Dom. 315.

† Lab. p. 1492. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 237. col. 2.

‡ Baron. An. 318. §. 18. [Ibid. p. 639. col. 1.] Bin. p. 239. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 1493. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 239. col. 1.

¶ Baron. An. 318. §. 22, &c. [Ibid. p. 640, &c.]

¶ Baron. An. 312. §. 91 et 92. [Ibid. p. 529, 530.]

and no doubt, if he did preside in this Council, it was not as Sylvester's legate (whom no ancient author records to have had any hand in this Council), but as the legate of Constantine. After these two Councils is placed a letter of this Emperor's to Alexander and Arius taken out of Eusebius, but is misplaced by the editors, since it is plain it was written in the beginning of the controversy about Arius, and not only before Constantine understood any thing of the matter, but before these Councils at Alexandria: but Baronius and the editors place it here on purpose to rail at Eusebius,* as if he put out an Arian forgery; whereas it is a great truth, and Constantine may well be supposed to write thus before he was rightly informed in the case; therefore those gentlemen do not hurt Eusebius's reputation, but their own, in accusing him so falsely, upon the old grudge of his not attesting their forgeries, devised and defended for the honour of the Roman Church.

§. 15. The Council of Laodicea (though it does not appear any Pope knew of it till after it was risen) they resolve shall be held under some Pope; the title saith Under Sylvester;† Labbé's margin saith Under Liberius, A.D. 364 or 357, or Under Damasus, 367: whereas in truth it was under no Pope; and being placed in the old collections of canons after those of Antioch, and also mentioning the Photinians, it must be held long after the Nicene Council;‡ but it was falsely placed before the Nicene Council by Baronius (our editor's main guide) to secure the book of Judith by the Council of Nice's authority.§ And the reasons given for this early placing it are very frivolous: for, first, the softening of a canon of Neocæsarea is no certain mark of time. Secondly, this Council rejects Judith out of the canon of Scripture, and so did the Council of Nice also; for though St. Jerome, when he had told us "this book is not of authority sufficient to determine controversies," adds, "that the Nicene synod is read to have computed it among holy writings."|| St. Jerome only means they allowed it to be read for instruction, but did not count it canonical; for doubtless he would not have rejected Judith if

* Bin. Not. p. 240. col. 2. et Baron. An. 318. §. 91. [Ibid. p. 661. col. 1.]

† Lab. p. 1495. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 241.

‡ Beveridg. Not. tom. 2. p. 193.

§ Richer. Hist. Conc. lib. 1. c. 3. p. 128. [p. 66. Colon. 1683.]

|| Hieron. Ep. 111. tom. 3. p. 34.

that Council had received it into the canon. And he saith "elsewhere, the Church indeed reads Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees, but receives them not among canonical Scriptures:"* and again, "a man may receive this book as he pleaseth."† Herein therefore the Council of Laodicea doth not contradict the Council of Nice at all, as these notes fasely pretend. Thirdly, this Council's decreeing the same things which were decreed at Nice without naming it, is no argument it was held before that of Nice; nothing being more ordinary than for later Councils to renew the older canons, without citing the former Councils for them.

The notes on the second canon at Laodicea (which supposes penitents to make their confession by prayer to God, and mentions no priest), would willingly graft the use of their modern sacramental confession to a priest upon this ancient canon;‡ but it rather confutes than countenances that modern device. Their labouring to expunge the Photinians out of the seventh canon, since all the old Greek copies have these words,§ is merely to justify their false date of this Council. The annotator on the fifteenth canon confesseth, that St. Paul commands all the people to join in the hymns, and that this use continued to St. Jerome's time; yet he owns their pretended apostolical Church hath altered this primitive custom grounded on holy Scripture, and that for very frivolous reasons.¶ But let it be observed, that this canon forbids not the people to bear a part in the church service; but allows them not to begin, or bring in any hymns into the public service. The seventeenth canon speaks of "the assemblies of the faithful" in two Latin versions, and the Greek is *Συνάξεις*; yet because the worst Latin translation reads, *in processionibus*, the notes impertinently run out into a discourse of their superstitious modern processions; for any thing serves them for an occasion to make their late devices seem ancients than they are.¶¶ The thirty-fourth canon mentions and censures those, who leaving the martyrs of Christ, go to false martyrs; and the fifty-first canon mentions the martyrs' feasts: upon which the notes most falsely infer,** that "the martyrs were then adored

* Hieron. Epist. 115. *ibid.* p. 39.

† Idem. Ep. 10. tom. 1. p. 96.

‡ Lab. p. 1523. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 248. col. 2.

§ Beveridg. Not. tom. 2. p. 193.

¶ Lab. p. 1524. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 249. col. 1.

¶¶ Lab. et Bin. *ibid.*

** Lab. p. 1526. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 250. col. 1.

with religious worship:" but this is only his invention: the canon speaks not one word of worshipping martyrs; but only, whereas the orthodox Christian assemblies were generally in the burial-places of true martyrs, where they offered up prayers to God; some it seems began to make separate meetings in places dedicated to false martyrs, and therefore the properest note here would have been to have set out the sin of schism, and the pious fraud (as they call it) of feigning false martyrs, of which their Church is highly guilty. The thirty-fifth canon expressly forbids leaving the church of God, and calling upon angels; which they say is a hidden kind of idolatry, and forsaking Christ the Son of God to go after idolatry. And Theodoret, who lived soon after the true time of this Council, saith, "Those who were for Moses's law, which was given by angels, brought in the worship of them; which error reigned long in Phrygia and Pisidia; and therefore the Council of Laodicea in Phrygia did by a law forbid the praying to angels."* Which canon doth so evidently condemn the Roman Church's prayers to the angels as idolatry, that the former editors of the Councils impudently corrupted the text of this canon, and put in *angulos* for *angelos*,† as if the Council had only forbid praying in private corners; whereas not only the Greek, but the oldest Latin copies, and Theodoret, have *angels*; but our editors and annotator having Baronius for their guide, venture to keep the true reading (*angels*) in the text, and put (*angles*) into the margin, hoping by false notes to ward off this severe blow.‡ And, first, the notes dare not produce the place of Theodoret at large; then they strive to blunder the reader with a distinction of *dulia* and *latria*, which can signify nothing here, because the canon and Theodoret both say "it is praying to angels which is forbid;" and that the Romanists certainly do. Again, Baronius censures Theodoret for saying, "that such heretics as were for Moses's law brought in ANGEL-worship:" but why doth he not censure St. Paul, who saith, "That those who were Jewishly inclined, and observed differences of meats, new moons, and sabbaths, were the inventors of angel-worship?"§ The angelic heretics in Epiphanius and St. Augustine, who came in afterwards, did not (as the notes represent) say "that angels were to be worshipped with the worship due to God alone:"

* Theodoret. in Coloss. c. 2.

† Edit. Merlini, Pet. Crab. et Barth. Caranz.

‡ Lab. p. 1526. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 250. col. 1.

§ Coloss. 2. ver. 16, 17, 18.

only as the Romanists now are, so they were inclined to worship angels;* that is, by praying to them. However, we Protestants say with Theodoret, we neither give them divine worship, nor divide the service due to the Divine majesty, between them and the true God.† And when the Romanists can say this honestly, and leave off praying to them, we will not tax them with this canon. Baronius hath one device more, *viz.* “that the angels, which this Council says must not be worshipped, were not good angels, but devils and the genii, adored by the Pagans; for (saith he) the former canon receives the worship of the true martyrs, and rejects that of false martyrs.” To which I answer, first, it is false (as was shewed) that the former canon receives the worship of any martyrs, true or false. Secondly, why doth not this canon call these *pseudo-angels* as the former called those it rejected *pseudo-martyrs*, if the prohibitions were of the same kind? Did ever any Christian call devils angels, without some addition, as evil angels, apostate angels, &c.? Besides, in that age when this Council was held (according to Baronius), the worship of demons, and the tutelar spirits, was public, not secret idolatry; so that it is manifest this canon speaks not to Pagans, but heretical Christians. And Theodoret shews that it was those angels who gave the law of Moses, which were hereby forbid to be prayed to; and I hope neither Binius nor his master will say these were devils: wherefore this canon plainly saith, “praying to good angels (as they of Rome now do) is idolatry.”

To conclude, The sixtieth canon of this Council is the most ancient account of the canon of Scripture, that ever was made by any Christian Synod, being the same which the Church of England holds at this day; for it leaves out all those books of Judith, Tobit, Wisdom, &c. which we account not to be canonical; but our annotator finding so primitive a Council contradicting their new Trent canon, and not being able to reconcile the difference, passeth this remarkable canon by without any note.

§. 16. The reproachful obscurity of Sylvester, in this time of action in all other Christian churches, puts the editors upon giving us a heap of forgeries together, to colour over the

* Aug. de Hæres. tom. 6. p. 4. m. [Angeli quibus non placet ut eos colamus tanquam nostros deos sed cum eis illorum et nostrum Deum. p. 418. vol. 7. Paris. 1838.] [Imitandos eos potius quam invocandos. *ibid.* p. 419.]

† Theod. de Curand. Græc. Aff. Serm. 3.

Pope's doing nothing remarkable for nine or ten years. First, We have an epistle of the Primitive Church and Constantine's munificence :* but Gratian, and the former editors of Councils, cited this as a decretal epistle of Melchiades, to prove the Pope's supremacy, &c. whereas the forgery is so gross, that our annotator affirms it to be a fiction of Isidore Mercator's, patched up of fragments stolen out of the history of the Nicene Council, the Council of Chalcedon, and St. Gregory's 24th epistle, and wofully mis-timed ;† yet being used to cite such forgeries (after this confession), he will not let it go without making some use of it ; for he notes, that what is said here of Constantine's donations to Melchiades and Sylvester, is very true, and may be firmly proved by Optatus Milevitanus. Very strange ! Optatus mentions no donation of Constantine to either of these Popes, *vid. supr.* §. 6. and therefore the reader may note, that false and weak inferences or quotations from manifest forgeries, are firm proofs with Baronius and Binus, when they make for the Roman interest ; but the best canons of the most genuine Councils are of no value when they make against it.

After this follows that odious forgery called Constantine's Donation ; wherein he is pretended to make over to the Pope the whole city of Rome, and all the Western empire, with all kind of ensigns of imperial majesty, and all manner of jurisdiction ; which ridiculous fiction (Naucerus saith) Antoninus rejected in his Chronicle, because it is not extant in any ancient author, but only in the Decretals.‡ But our editors print it without any note of its being false ; yea, with notes upon it, to prove it either true or very probable.§ And Baronius introduces it with many stories, to make all that concerns the Pope's temporal greatness credible to an easy reader ;|| yet at last, to secure their retreat from so indefensible a post, he and the annotator make it a fiction of the poor Greeks : I shall therefore, first, prove it a forgery ; and secondly, make it out, that not the Greeks, but the Pope's creatures devised it. First, That it is a fiction appears from divers arguments : for, first, who can believe Constantine so unjust, first to give Rome and the Western empire to the Pope, and then to one of his

* Lab. p. 1528. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 250. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 1530. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 251. col. 2^a.

‡ Naucier. Chron. gen. 11. p. 604.

§ Lab. p. 1534. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 215. col. 2. et p. 254. col. 1.

|| Baron. An. 324. §. 117. [Ibid. vol. 4. p. 68, 69.]

sons? Or who can think the Pope so tame, never to put in his claim? Secondly, This edict is grounded on the idle story of Constantine's baptism by Sylvester, which out of Sylvester's fabulous acts is related at large in it; but those acts being (as was shewed) a mere forgery, this edict must be so^a also. Thirdly, It represents Constantine, who was born and brought up under Christian parents and had settled Christianity before this, as a mere heathen, till he met with Sylvester at this time. Fourthly, It pretends the whole senate and all the nobles joined with the Emperor to give the Pope this power. But besides the folly of Constantine's delegating more power than ever he himself had, it is most false to suppose, that the whole senate at this time were Christians; for many of them continued Pagans long after Constantine's death. Baronius indeed (out of Sylvester's acts) affirms, "that none of the senate was converted before the year 324;"* forgetting that he had told us "divers senators had given up their names to Christ twelve years before;"† and that one or both of the consuls were Christians two years before this.‡ So ill a memory had the great cardinal, when his cause obliged him to defend a lie. Fifthly, It speaks of the Emperor's intending to build a city, and call it by his own name, in the province of Byzantium, and his resolution to transfer his empire thither; and yet before this, the edict had reckoned up Constantinople by name, and Jerusalem, as two of the five patriarchates, and given Rome jurisdiction over all the other four. Lastly, It is dated in the fourth consulship of Constantine with Gallicanus; whereas Licinius was his colleague in his fourth consulship, which was in the year of Christ 315, that is, nine years before the time fixed by Baronius for this pretended baptism; and that clearly shews the story to be all sham, as all modest and learned men of the Roman Church do now acknowledge: but Baronius and our annotator, considering not barely the falsehood of this edict (for that alone would not discourage them), but observing also that it destroys the pretended divine right of the Pope's supremacy, grant it at last to be a forgery, but say, it was devised by the Greeks. Secondly, Therefore I shall shew the falsehood of that accusation: for, first, they charge Balsamon with publishing it: now he did not write till A.D. 1180, yet the notes out of Baronius do confess, that a Pope quoted it

* Baron. An. 324. §. 76. [Ibid. p. 55, 56.]

† Id. An. 312. §. 75, et 76. [Ibid. vol. 3. p. 524.]

‡ Id. An. 322. §. 1. [Ibid. vol. 4, p. 27. col. 1.]

A.D. 1054 (that is, near a hundred years before Balsamon was born), to justify his superiority over the Greek Church; and therefore Balsamon was not the inventor of it. Secondly, It doth the Greeks no good, for it gives the Pope power over all their patriarchs, and reckons Constantinople as the last and lowest patriarchate, so that the forger could not come out of that Church. Thirdly, It is grounded on the fabulous acts of Sylvester writ in Latin, and feigned in the western world; and its whole design is to advance the Pope above all bishops, kings, and emperors; and therefore no doubt it was advanced by a friend of the Pope's. Fourthly, The notes confess, "that a Pope first set up this edict, to prove his universal supremacy (not considering with Baronius, it seems, that it weakened his title), and the grave and learned men of the Roman Church received it as authentic for many ages after." We add, that till the Reformation they cited it, and writ in defence of it; and though now their point is gained, they begin to renounce it; yet the advantage that Church got by it, shews that they were the forgers of it; yea, it seems A.D. 1339, one Johannes Diaconus, a member of the Roman Church, was thought to be the author of it. Fifthly, Whoever considers how unwilling the cardinal and our annotator are to have it clearly rejected, will be convinced, that their Church gained by it, and consequently invented it. They labour to prove "the Pope's temporal power granted hereby, is both probable and true."* And though they own the French princes Pepin and Charles, who gave many cities and countries to St. Peter, never mention this edict; yet they argue from their calling those gifts, a restoring them to the Church, that they had respect to Constantine's bounty.† These authors also mention Pope Adrian's confirming this edict, and quote the book of Constantine's munificence (shewed to be a fable just now) to justify it.‡ They also would make out what it saith of the images of Peter and Paul, then kept at Rome, by Eusebius, but cite him falsely, leaving out the main part of his testimony, viz. "that it was only some who had such images, and that these imitated the Pagans herein;" from whence it will not follow, that eminent Christians then placed them in their churches.§ In short,

* Lab. p. 1539. [vol. 1. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 254. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 1540. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 254. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 1541. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 255. col. 1.

§ Lab. et Bin. ut supr. [ut supra.] Baron. An. 324. §. 30. [ut supra, p. 39.]

though they dare not say it is true, yet they would not have it rejected as false, because it gives their admired Church so much riches and power; and therefore doubtless no Greeks, but some of their Church, invented this most notorious forgery: and *Æneas Sylvius* observes, that "it was warily done of the Popes, to let it be hotly disputed how far this edict was good in law, that so the edict itself might still be supposed valid,* it being their interest it should be thought so."

This feigned donation is followed by a Roman Council under *Sylvester*, in the preface whereof *Sylvester* is falsely pretended to have called the Nicene Council; and in the body of which there is a canon, "that none must judge the chief seat; nor the emperor, nor kings, nor clergy, nor people:" for the sake of which two advantageous fictions, *Baronius* and the annotator defend and justify this Synod;† though the title be ridiculous, the style barbarous, and the matter of it as void of sense as it is of probability. *Labbé* indeed notes, "that the condemning *Photinus* here shews, it was put together by an unskilful hand,"‡ and rejects it as a forgery very justly: for *Photinus* (as the notes confess) was not condemned till long after;§ nor were there any Christian kings, but *Constantine* the emperor at that time. Besides, the forger first says, "none of the laity were present;" and yet in the next page affirms, that *Calphurnius* (prefect of the city) was there, and that *Constantine* and his mother *Helena* subscribed it:¶ yea, *Baronius* himself, observes, that this Council mistakes the custom of the Roman Church, where in that age presbyters used to sit in the presence of the bishops; but in this fiction they are represented as standing with the deacons.¶ Moreover, it destroys the donation (lies seldom hanging together); for if *Constantine* had given the Pope such supreme power a few days before, what need was there for these bishops to grant the same thing; or, however, why do they not remember *Constantine's* late gift? Lastly, *Arius* (who then gave so great trouble to the Church) is not mentioned here, not (as *Baronius* guesses) because he was to be more solemnly condemned at *Nice* the

* *Æne. Sylv. Dial. de Donat. Constantini.*

† *Baron. An. 324. §. 29, 30, et 130. [Ibid. p. 39. 72.] Bin. Not. p. 260.*

‡ *Lab. Marg. p. 1542.*

§ *Bin. p. 260, col. 1.*

¶ *Lab. p. 1547. Bin. p. 256. col. 2. et p. 257. col. 2.*

¶ *Baron. An. 324. §. 124. [§. 126.] [Ibid. p. 71. col. 1.]*

next year;* but because the forger had nothing in his eye, but merely to set off the grandeur of Rome.

§. 17. We are now come to the first and most famous General Council of Nice,† wherein the worst and most dangerous of all heresies was suppressed; and yet the pretended judge of all controversies, and supreme head of the Church, had so little share in this glorious transaction, that it is very uncertain in what Pope's time it was called. Sozomen and Nicephorus say it was in the time of Julius;‡ others think it was in Sylvester's time; Photius affirms it was in the times of both Sylvester and Julius,§ though unhappily Pope Mark was between them two: yet this Council is introduced by a preface *a la mode a Rome*, styled, "The History of the Council of Nice;"|| wherein (as well as in the notes and various editions of this famous Council) all imaginable artifice is used to abuse the reader into a belief, that Pope Sylvester not only called this Council, and presided in it by his legates; but also confirmed it by his sole authority afterwards. For the clearer confutation of which falsehoods, we will consider, first, The authority which convened this Council. Secondly, The president of it, with the order of sitting in it, and subscribing to it. Thirdly, The power which confirmed it. Fourthly, The number of the canons. Fifthly, The true sense of them. Sixthly, The forgeries for supremacy hercin inserted. Seventhly, The corrupt editions of the Council itself.

First, As to the authority convening it. The preface saith, "Constantine assembled it by Sylvester's authority."¶ The notes affirm,— "it was appointed by the advice, counsel, and authority of Pope Sylvester:" and again, — "Pope Sylvester, by his pontifical authority, decreed the celebration of a General Council."** To prove these vain brags, they cite Ruffinus (whose version of this Council they reject); yet he only saith, "that Constantine convened it by the advice of the bishops." However, this is advice, not authority; and advice of the bishops in general, not of Sylvester in particular; and if any bishops did give the Emperor particular advice, it was those of Alexandria and Constantinople, not he of Rome. Secondly,

* Baron. An. 324. §. 27. [Ibid. p. 38.] Lab. p. 1555. Bin. p. 260. col. 2.

† An. Dom. 325.

‡ Sozom. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 16. Niceph. lib. 8. cap. 14.

§ Phot. de 7. Synod.

|| Lab. tom. 2. p. 3. [Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 262.

¶ Lab. p. 3. et Bin. p. 262. [Lut. Par. 1671. et p. 3. vol. 2. Venet. 1728.]

** Lab. p. 63. C. Bin. p. 291. col. 1.

They quote the sixth General Council (held 350 years after this of Nice, and in other things rejected by the Romanists), which saith,—“this Council was called by Sylvester and Constantine :” but they quote falsely, for that sixth Synod puts the Emperor’s name first ;* and though they are no evidence against authors living in the time of the Nicene Council ; yet even this shews, they thought the Emperor’s authority was chiefest in this matter. The notes also cite the Pontifical (which they have so often rejected as fabulous) and Sozomen, as if they said the same thing : but for Sozomen, he never names Sylvester ; but saith, Pope Julius was absent by reason of his great age ; and the Pontifical only saith, it was called by the consent of Sylvester, not by his authority ; and indeed it was called by the consent of all orthodox bishops. Wherefore there is no good evidence, that the Pope did call it. But on the other side, all the ecclesiastical historians do agree, that Constantine convened it by his own authority, and sent his letters to command the bishops to meet at Nice ;† and not one of them mentions Sylvester as having any hand in this matter : yea, (to put us out of all doubt) the very Council of Nice itself (in their Synodal epistle writ to Alexandria, and extant in these very editors)‡ expressly declares, that they were convened by Constantine’s command. Which clear and convincing proofs shew the impudence, as well as the falsehood of the annalist and annotator, to talk so confidently of the Pope’s authority in this matter ; who, if he had (as they pretend) convened this Council, should have summoned more Western bishops, of which there were so few in this Council, that it is plain, either Sylvester did not summon them, or they did not obey his summons.

Secondly, As to the President of this Council, and the order of sitting in it, and subscribing to it. The preface and notes falsely affirm, that Hosius, Vitus, and Vincentius were all three the Pope’s legates, and presidents of this Council ;§ and vainly think, if it had not been so, it could not have been a General Council. But if this be necessary to the being of a General Council, surely there is some good evidence of it. Quite contrary ! The preface to the Sardican Council is of the editors or their friends’ making, and so is no proof. Athanasius

* Bin. tom. 3. par. 1. p. 194.

† Euseb. vit. Constant. lib. 3. cap. 6. Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 8. Theod. lib. 1. cap. 7. Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 17.

‡ Lab. p. 59. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 285. et Baron. An. 325. §. 117. § Lab. p. 3, et 65. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 263, et 291.

saith, Hosius was a prince in the Synods; but not that he was president of this Synod, or the Pope's legate. Cedrenus and Photius are too late authors to outweigh more ancient, and authentic writers; yet they do not say (as the notes pretend), that Sylvester, by his legates, gave authority to this Council: yea, Photius places the Bishop of Constantinople before Sylvester and Julius, even when he is speaking of the chief bishops who met at Nice; and he is grossly mistaken also, because neither of the Popes did meet there.* Socrates only saith, the Bishop of Rome's presbyters were his proxies, and present at this Council;† but hereby he excludes Hosius (who was a bishop) from being a legate, and doth not at all prove Vitus and Vincentius were presidents. Sozomen names not Hosius, but these two presbyters as the proxies of Pope Julius; but reckons that Pope himself in the fourth place;‡ though these notes in citing Sozomen (according to their usual sincerity) place the Bishop of Rome first, and all the other patriarchs after him. Finally, They cite the subscriptions to prove these three were legates and presidents at Nice; but Richerius (a learned Romanist) saith, "These subscriptions are of as little credit as the epistle to Sylvester."§ and adds, "That the placing these presbyters before the bishops is a plain proof, that all these subscriptions were invented in later ages, because the Pope's legates never did precede any of the patriarchs till the Council of Chalcedon."|| As for Hosius, he had been the Emperor's legate long before, and divers of the ancients say, he was very eminent in this Council; but not one of them affirms, that Hosius was the Pope's legate. This is purely an invention of Baronius; but he only proves it by conjectures.¶ The truth is, Constantine himself was the president of this Council, and sat on a gilded throne (not as the preface saith falsely, "below all the bishops," but) "above all the bishops," as Eusebius, an eye-witness, relates;** and the notes at last own he sat in the chief place;†† yea, the annalist confesseth, "he

* Photii Nomocan. p. 163.

† Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 5.

‡ Sozom. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 16.

§ Richer. de Concil. gen. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 6. [p. 18. Colon. 1683. Richerius adds, *Equidem cum maximo animi mœrore dicere cogor NULLOS EXTARE LIBROS IN QUIBUS TOT TANTAQUE FICTITIA ET ADULTERINA SCRIPTA QUAM IN TOMIS CONCILIORUM LEGANTUR; et illos qui ejusmodi ambiguis atque suspectis scriptioribus et epistolis auctoritatem sedis apostolicæ tueri nituntur eidem non mediocriter incommodare.*]

|| Id. ib. §. 8.

¶ Baron. An. 325. §. 20. [ut supra, p. 93.]

** Euseb. vit. Constant. lib. 3. cap. 10.

†† Lab. p. 67. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 292. col. 2.]

acted the part of a moderator in it.”* Richerius goes farther, saying, “It is clear by undoubted testimonies, that the appointing and convening of this Council depended on the authority of Constantine, who was the president thereof;”† and he blames Baronius and Binius, for wilfully mistaking the Pope’s consent (which was requisite, as he was bishop of an eminent Church) for his authority, to which no Pope in that age pretended. It is true, there were some bishops who were chief among the ecclesiastics in this Council. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, sat uppermost on the right side, and opened the Synod with a speech to Constantine.‡ Hence some (and among the rest Pope Felix, in his epistle to Zeno) affirm, he was president of this Council.§ Others say, the bishop of Alexandria presided; and indeed all the patriarchs present sat above all others of the clergy;|| yet so, as they all gave place to the Emperor, when he came in. And for the Pope’s legates, Baronius and Bellarmine do contend in vain about the places they had in this Council, since no ancient author tells us they sat above the chief of the bishops; so that this also is a forgery of the Papal flatterers, to give countenance to their Church’s feigned supremacy.

Thirdly, As to the power which confirmed the canons of this Council, the ancient historians do suppose, that Constantine gave these decrees their binding power, and record his letters to enjoin all to observe them.¶ And Eusebius, who was there, saith, that “the Emperor ratified the decrees with his seal.”** But the annalist and annotator seek to efface this evidence by railing at Eusebius, and by devising many weak pretences, to persuade the credulous, that Pope Sylvester confirmed this Council by his authority; and both the preface and notes tell us, that this Synod writ a letter to Sylvester for his confirmation; and that he called a Council at Rome, and writ back to ratify what they had done.†† But whoever will but read these two epistles, will find the Latin so barbarous, and the sense so intricate, that nothing is plain in them, but that they are forged;‡‡ and Labbé’s margin tells us they are

* Baron. An. 325. §. 73. [Ibid. p. 111, 112.]

† Richer. Hist. Con. 2. §. 2, 3, 4. [Lib. 1. p. 11. ut supra.]

‡ Theodoret. apud Baron. An. 325. §. 54.

§ Vid. Richer. Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 8. [p. 22. ut supra.]

|| Phot. lib. de 7. Synod.

¶ Vid. Socrat. Sozom. Theodoret. et Ruffin. ut supra.

** Euseb. vit. Constan. lib. 1. cap. 37.

†† Lab. p. 6, et 77. [vol 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 64, et 299. col. 1.

‡‡ Lab. p. 68. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 348. col. 1.

fictions, nor dare Baronius own them to be genuine;* and though Binius cites them for evidence in his notes, yet at some distance he tells us, "it is evident they are both corrupted;"† and again he says, "if they were not both extreme faulty and commentitious, they might be evidence in this case."‡ But Richerius is more ingenuous, and declares, that "these epistles are prodigiously false," the forger of them being so ignorant, as to call Macarius (who was then bishop of Jerusalem) bishop of Constantinople: yet our annotator cites Dionysius Exiguus for a witness of these epistles; whereas Richerius shews they were forged by some ignorant monk long after Dionysius's time, who mentions not the Pope's confirming of these canons, nor doth he remember these epistles; but only saith, it was agreed "these canons should be sent to Sylvester, bishop of Rome."§ The notes further urge, a Roman Council under Pope Sylvester, to prove his confirming these canons; but that Council is a confessed forgery itself, and so proves nothing.|| Lastly, The annotator here (and almost every where) cites Socrates's speaking of "an ecclesiastical canon, that no decrees of Council should be valid without the consent of the Roman bishop."¶ But, first, consent is not confirmation. It is the privilege of every patriarch, as well as of him of Rome, that a General Council cannot be held without every one of their consents; but this proves not their pretended sole and supreme power of ratifying all Councils vested in the Pope: besides, Socrates here only historically relates what Pope Julius said in his own case; and therefore the testimony relies on Julius's credit; and indeed that was a peculiar case, wherein, when the cause of Athanasius was referred, by consent of all parties, to Julius as arbitrator, the Arians took it out of his hands against Athanasius's mind, and judged it in a Council, to which Julius was not at all summoned, which doubtless was very illegal and unjust: but yet none can tell where this ecclesiastical canon was made, which the angry and injured Pope here cites; and therefore till it appear whence Julius had this canon, we must be excused if we give no great deference to it; and unless they could prove it was recorded

* Baron. An. 325. §. 37. [ut supra, p. 98.]

† Bin. p. 348. col. 1. marg.

‡ Idem. p. 365. col. 1. not. ad. Concil. Rom.

§ Richer. Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 6.

|| Labbé, marg. p. 412.

¶ Socrat. Histor. lib. 2. cap. 13.

before the Nicene Council, it is very impertinent to expect the Nicene Fathers should govern their actions by it. So that we conclude not Sylvester but Constantine confirmed this Council.

Fourthly, As to the number of the canons the annotator also notoriously prevaricates. He confesses, that all the Greeks, and particularly Theodoret and Ruffinus, assert there were but twenty canons made there: yea, that the sixth Council of Carthage (within less than a hundred years), after a diligent search in the three patriarchal seats of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, could find no more than twenty canons: * but the notes conceal Gratian's naming no more but twenty canons, and his saying, there are but only twenty Nicene canons to be found in the Roman Church. † For all this, the annotator boldly tells us, "that the truer opinion (or rather that which is most for the Pope's interest) is, that more than twenty canons were made there:" ‡ but we will examine his and Baronius's reasons. § First, They say there is no decree about Easter among the twenty canons: I reply, there is a genuine epistle of Constantine's, in which this matter is determined, with the reasons for it, which is better than a bare law without arguments, in a case which had been so much disputed; § nor could they make any accurate canon about it, till the exact time was calculated, which they referred (not to the Pope, but) to the Bishop of Alexandria. Secondly, The notes say St. Ambrose mentions a canon made at Nice against bigamists; || but Baronius himself confesseth, that St. Ambrose only saith, they treated of this matter, but doth not affirm they made a canon about it. Thirdly, They plead there was a decree about the canon of Scripture made at Nice (which is not among these twenty), because St. Jerome saith, he had read that the Nicene Fathers computed Judith among the books of holy Scripture: I reply, St. Jerome only saith, they computed it among holy writings, that is (as we shewed before, §. 15), among books to be read for instruction, not to be quoted in dispute: for if St. Jerome had believed that this Council did receive Judith for canonical, he would not have counted it (as he doth) to be apocryphal: so that this proves not that there were more canons. Fourthly,

* Lab. p. 71. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 395. col. 2.

† Gratian: dist. 16. cap. 10. et cap. 13.

‡ Baron. An. 325. §. 157, &c. [ut supra, p. 141. col. 2.]

§ Bin. 2. p. 285. et Theod. lib. 1. cap. 9.

|| Ambros. Ep. 82. ad Episc. Veracel.

The notes affirm, there is no canon now extant here against a bishop's choosing his successor in his lifetime ; which St. Augustine saith was forbid in this Council ;* which is a gross untruth, since the eighth canon forbids two bishops should be in one city ; and the notes own this was the very canon meant by St. Augustine, in the next leaf.† Liars should have better memories. Fifthly, They say the third Council of Carthage cites a canon of Nice, forbidding to receive the sacrament after dinner ; but if the place be considered (as Richerius‡ notes), that Council only refers to a former African Synod, which had decreed this, and not to the Council of Nice. Sixthly, The annotator speaks of a canon about appeals to Rome, cited out of this synod in the sixth Council of Carthage : but he was wiser than to tell us who cited this for a Nicene canon ; for it was Pope Zosimus's legate cited it, and he was convicted of a notorious falsification therein, as shall be shewed in due place. Seventhly, He saith there was a canon made at Nice, but not to be found among the twenty, that a cause tried in a lesser synod, might be judged over again in a greater ; and for this he cites the fourth epistle of Julius : but in his notes on that epistle,§ he confesseth this was no canon made at Nice, but only it was matter of fact, in that this great synod did judge Arius over again, who had before been judged at Alexandria. Eighthly, The notes say, Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, at Chalcedon did affirm, "that the Nicene Council agreed upon a form of writing communicatory epistles, which is not among these twenty canons : " I reply, Baronius and he both own this form was to be a secret among the bishops : and if it had been put into a canon, heretics might easily have counterfeited these forms, and so the design had been spoiled.|| Lastly, The annotator cites Sozomen to prove that the Nicene Council added to the *Gloria Patri* the latter part, "As it was in the beginning," &c. Whereas Sozomen¶ in that place, only speaks of such as praised God in hymns, agreeing to the faith delivered at Nice ; but mentions no canon or form of words agreed on at Nice about these hymns. So that after all this shuffling, it is very impertinent for this

* Augustin. Epist. 110.

† Bin. Not. p. 296. col. 1. et p. 297. col. 2.

‡ Richer. Histor. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 3. §. 13. [p. 66. Colon, 1683.]

§ Bin. Not. in Ep. Julii, p. 395. col. 2.

|| Baron. An. 325. §. 166. [ut supra, p. 144. col. 1.] et Richer. hb. 1. cap. 3. §. 14.

¶ Sozom. Histor. lib. 3. cap. 19.

annotator to brag, that it is manifest there were more than twenty canons made in the Council; and nonsense to tell us, that the Greeks, who stiffly maintain there were but twenty canons, cannot deny but that there were more than twenty: and for all his confidence, neither he nor Baronius dare defend those eighty canons which Turrian hath fathered on this Council; and therefore whatever is more than these twenty, or differing from them, must pass among the many forgeries of the Roman Church.

Fifthly, As to the sense of those canons which oppose the Pope's interest, the notes use many impostures in expounding them. The third canon forbids "the clergy to cohabit with women taken into their houses, unless they were so near of kin as to avoid suspicion and scandal." Which plainly supposes that they might have wives, because cohabiting with them could give no suspicion nor scandal: and since the canon names not wives, who were the most likely to dwell with their husbands, doubtless this Council did not suppose the cohabitation of the clergy with their wives to be unlawful. Yea, not only Socrates and Sozomen,* but Pisanus and Nauclerus, later Romish authors,† relate the history of Paphnutius's advice to the Council in this point; upon which the latter saith, "the Nicene Fathers allowed priests to have wives, if they pleased." Which full evidence against their Church's practice doth so enrage Baronius, that he not only denies this well attested history, but lays by the character of an historian, and falls (in his guessing way) to dispute against this manifest truth.‡ And Binius in his notes out of him,§ saith, "this canon expressly forbids clergymen the use of their wives, after they were entered into holy orders;" rejects the history of Paphnutius, and gives Socrates and Sozomen the lie: but we shall leave the reader to judge, whether he will give more credit to the words of the canon, and these ancient impartial historians, or to the corrupt paraphrase and impudent assertions of these two notorious sycophants, who have so often been proved to govern themselves, not by truth, but by interest and design. The sixth canon reckons the Pope but equal to other great bishops, and limits his jurisdiction; at which the annalist and annotator are much discomposed, and (by various fictions and shuffling

* Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 8. Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 22.

† Pisanus ap. Bin. p. 343. col. 1. Naucler. Chron. p. 606.

‡ Baron. An. 325. §. 148, 149, 150. [ut supra, p. 139.]

§ Lab. p. 72. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 296. col. 2.

pretences) labour to pervert the true sense of this famous canon. And first, they say, "the beginning of it (*viz.* the Roman Church hath always had the primacy) is wanting :"* whereas no authentic edition ever had any such beginning. Dr. Beveridge gives us eight several versions, besides the original Greek, which all want it;† and it is impudently done of Binius, to cite Alarus Copus, saying, that Dionysius Exiguus's version had this beginning ; since that very version is printed by Binius himself, without any such preamble;‡ but it is all one to him, true or false ; in his notes he makes a foolish paraphrase on this forged preface, about the Divine right of the Pope to his supremacy ; whereas the plain words of the genuine canon shew, that this Council grounded the jurisdiction of these great bishops only upon ancient custom :§ nor can it be gathered from this canon, that the Bishop of Rome then had any superiority over him of Alexandria ; the one being allowed as much power within his own limits, as the other had in his. It is plain, the great bishops are all here declared to be equal, without any exception or salvo, upon the Bishop of Rome's account ; which would have been mentioned, as well as the rights of the metropolitan of Cæsarea are, when the Bishop of Jerusalem's place is assigned in the seventh canon, if the Council of Nice had believed Rome had any right to a supremacy over all the rest. The annotator is also angry at Ruffinus : and though upon the fourteenth canon he says, " Ruffinus set down the the true authentic canons ;" || yet because his version of this sixth canon limits the Pope's jurisdiction to suburbicarian regions, he first falsely represen's the words of Ruffinus, adding to them,—" which above all others are subject peculiarly to the diocese of the Roman Church : " and then rails at the version itself, as evil, erroneous, and proceeding from his ignorance. But doubtless Ruffinus, who lived so near the time of this Council, and knew Rome and Italy so well, understood the Pope's jurisdiction at that time, and the meaning of this canon far better than Binius ; and therefore Baronius (after he had condemned the version) yet strives to accommodate it to their new Roman sense. But there is full evidence, that these suburbicarian regions were only those provinces which

* Lab. et Bin. ut supr. not. in Can. 6.

† Beveridg. Concil. tom. 2. p. 50.

‡ Lab. p. 45, 46. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 276.

§ Richer. Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 11.

|| Lab. p. 75. B. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 298. col. 1.

were under the prefect of Rome; that is, some part of Italy, and some of the adjacent islands; and these were all the churches which were then under the Pope's jurisdiction: as may appear by the great difficulty which the succeeding bishops of Rome found in the following ages, to bring Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna (churches in Italy itself) to be in subjection to them: so that the Pope was so far from having an universal supremacy then, that Balsamon is mistaken in thinking he was made Patriarch of all the Western Church; for the very fifth canon, which "orders all causes to be heard, and finally ended in the same province where they happened," not only destroys appeals to Rome, but shews that no bishop did then pretend to so large a jurisdiction. Again, these notes frequently brag of that version of this canon, which the Pope's legate cited at Chalcedon;* wherein the aforesaid forged title of this canon ("the Church of Rome hath always had the primacy") is quoted as part of the canon itself: but the acts of that Council of Chalcedon shew that this edition was discovered to be false by the Constantinopolitan code, then produced: and if the Fathers there had believed this to be the true reading, they would not immediately have contradicted the first famous General Council, by giving the Bishop of Constantinople equal privileges with him of old Rome: so that their quoting a false, baffled, and rejected version of this canon, rather pulls down than supports their dear supremacy; to maintain which, they have nothing but sophistry and fraud, as the next section will shew.

Sixthly, Therefore we will consider the impostures and fictions annexed to this Council, to give colour to their feigned supremacy: and first, because Eusebius speaks little of the Popes, for he could not truly say much of them, Baronius and the annotator invent all the calumnies against him imaginable; and the former (though he have little true history in his Annals for three hundred years together, which is not taken out of Eusebius) rails at him most unjustly, as being an Arian; a malicious, fraudulent, and partial writer.† And Binius treats this great historian at the same rate: but Athanasius expressly saith, that Eusebius of Cæsarea subscribed the orthodox faith.‡

* Concil. Chalced. Act. 16.

† Baron. An. 318. §. 46. [ut supra, vol. 3. p. 647.] An. 324. §. 136, 143, et 152. [Ibid. vol. 4. p. 74, 78, 81.] item An. 325. §. 192, &c. [Ibid. p. 152, &c.]

‡ Athan. Apol. cont. Arian. p. 180.

Socrates affirms also, "that he agreed to the faith of the Nicene Council."* Pisanus, his Greek author of the history of this Council, brings in Eusebius disputing against the Arians:† and Valesius, in his life, clears him from this spiteful accusation, which these men invent merely to be revenged on him for not countenancing the Pope's supremacy; which is not his fault, but his virtue, because there was no such thing pretended to in his days. Secondly, These editors publish a letter of Athanasius to Pope Marcus, with that Pope's answer,‡ among the records of this Council; and the annotator often cites them to prove the supremacy and infallibility, because the Roman Church is here called, "the mother and head of all churches," and, "a church which had never erred;" and the Pope is called, "Bishop of the universal Church;" yet their being forged is so notorious, that Bellarmine, Possevin, and Baronius§ reject them. Thirdly, They likewise publish in these Nicene acts an epistle of Pope Julius, wherein divers canons for the primacy are fathered on this great Council:¶ and Pisanus is so bold and so vain as to defend this to be genuine, by an epistle of the Egyptians to Pope Felix (owned to be forged),¶ and by other decretal epistles as false as this, which he defends: but it is so manifest a forgery, this of Pope Julius, that the editors themselves afterwards reject it.** Fourthly, Whereas the ninth canon of Chalcedon allows the clergy to complain to the primate, or to the bishop of the royal city of Constantinople; notes are put upon this to falsify that canon, which say, that Constantinople is here put for Rome.†† Fifthly, Here is a canon called the thirty-ninth of Nice, which saith, "he that holds the See of Rome is the head and prince of all patriarchs; because he is first, as Peter, to whom power is given over all Christian princes and people;"‡‡ which must be a forgery of some Roman parasite, because it not only contradicts the sixth canon of the genuine Council of Nice, but the eighth of these pretended canons, which limits the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction to the places near to him.§§ However, the editors say, Steuchus, Turrian, and Cope cite it; and they print Turrian's notes upon it,

* Socrat. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 3.

† Bin. p. 313. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 287. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 326. col. 1, et 2.

§ Baron. An. Dom. 336. ¶ Bin. p. 328. col. 2.

¶ Bin. p. 499. col. 1.

** Lab. p. 483. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 391.

col. 1.

†† Bin. p. 331. col. 1.

‡‡ Lab. p. 303. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 337. col. 2.

§§ Lab. p. 294. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 333. col. 1.

which affirm it to agree with the sixth canon of the true edition; and would prove it genuine by no better evidence than a forged decretal of Anacletus.* By which we see the most apparent falsehoods shall be published and defended, if they do but promote the supremacy.

Lastly, We will make some remarks on the corrupt editions of this Council. First, That of Alfonsus Pisanus is so fabulous that Labbé for mere shame omits it;† but Binius prints it at large, with all its fictions and impostures;‡ of which Riche-rius gives this character: “By this history of Pisanus we may learn, not what the Council of Nice was, but what it should be to fit it for a Jesuit’s palate; for he hath scraped together all the falsehoods and forgeries he could find, for enlarging the number of the canons.”§ But I must add, that there are divers passages in this edition, which will not serve the ends of the modern Roman flatterers: for first, Pisanus, his Greek author, highly extols Eusebius;|| for which the Jesuit corrects him with a note in the margin. Secondly, The orthodox bishop bids the philosopher believe that which was written, but not to regard things unwritten, because the faith is grounded on holy Scripture:¶ whereas the margin cautions the reader not to think that this is spoken against ecclesiastical traditions, though it be levelled at them. Thirdly, Hosius doth not subscribe (as the Pope’s legates here do) for Pope Sylvester; wherefore this compiler did not think him to be the Pope’s legate.** Fourthly, It is here said to have been declared at Nice, that every bishop under God was the head of his own church.†† Fifthly, Here is printed that part of the African bishop’s letter to Celestine, wherein they blame this legate for falsely citing the Nicene canons.‡‡ So also the eighty canons were not invented by a thorough-paced friend to the Roman modern interest, and therefore probably Baronius will not defend them.§§ The eighth canon (as was noted) limits the Pope’s jurisdiction to such places as were near him. The twenty-fourth and sixty-sixth of these canons clearly declare, that some bishops had wives,||| forbidding bigamy, and

* Bin. p. 358 col. 1.

† Lab. marg. p. 106.

‡ Bin. p. 300. col. 1.
[p. 41. Colon. 1681.]

§ Richer. Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. ult.

|| Bin. p. 301. col. 2. et 302. col. 2.

¶ Bin. p. 316. col. 1.

** Bin. p. 322. col. 1.

†† Bin. p. 325. col. 2.

‡‡ Bin. p. 328. col. 1.

§§ Baron. An. 325. §. 53 [ut supra, p. 105. col. 1.]

||| Bin. p. 335. col. 2. et p. 341. col. 1.

compelling them to take their first wife again. And there are other like examples, which are not worth setting down, because they are all forged in later times, as appears by their citing a fabulous discourse out of the life of St. Anthony, falsely ascribed to the great Athanasius,* by their quoting a spurious work under the name of Dionysius Areopagita, which was (as all agree) written after the Nicene Council many years;† by their giving the patriarch of Antioch jurisdiction over the archbishop of Cyprus, who was always free from that subjection, as was declared long after in the Council of Ephesus.‡ Finally, Though this Pisanus do impudently reject the true story of Paphnutius's advising to leave the clergy at liberty to marry; which history is in his author, and in Gelasius Cyzicenus also; yet he magnifies a ridiculous fiction afterward of two bishops, which signed the Nicene faith after they were dead and buried.§ A fable so gross, that Baronius rejects it, with a note which I wish he had often remembered, *viz.* "that it was not usual among Christians to confirm the faith by miracles, which was attested by more firm evidences of holy Scripture."|| Secondly, Turrian's edition of this Council repeats all these eighty canons, and in his preface and his notes he vindicates them all; and yet the tracts which he cites to prove these canons genuine, are owned to be spurious by all modest Romanists, and his arguments are so trifling they are not worth confuting. We will only note, therefore, that the seventh and the fortieth of these canons require that synods shall be held twice a year, which (as Turrian confesseth) agrees not with the custom of the Roman Church:¶ and his notes say, the seventy-second canon differs from the thirteenth, and the seventy-third canon is contrary to the forty-ninth;** but he will rather suppose the holy Nicene Fathers contradicted themselves than own any of these canons to be forged, because some of them seem to favour the Pope's supremacy. As to the edition of Gelasius Cyzicenus, it is generally a very modest account of this Council, and hath not many errors in it; but like all other ancient authors, it speaks very little of the Pope; for which

* Bin. p. 302. col. 2. Vid. Rivet. Crit. Sacr. lib. 3. cap. 4.

† Bin. p. 336. col. 2.

‡ Bin. p. 337. col. 1. Vid. Concil. Ephesin. Act. 7.

§ Bin. p. 347. col. 2.

|| Baron. An. 325. §. 182. [ut supra, p. 149. col. 1.]

¶ Lab. p. 294. et 303. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 353. col. 2. et 358. col. 1.

** Lab. p. 315. [ut supra] Bin. p. 363. col. 1, et 2.

reason Binius claps it under hatches, and will not produce it till the latter end of his second tome after the Council of Ephesus, to convince us that all authors are valued or slighted merely as they promote or discourage the usurpations of Rome.

§. 18. To all these impostures, contrived to misrepresent this famous General Council, there is tacked a third Council at Rome under Sylvester, in the presence of Constantine ; wherein that Pope with 275 bishops are said to confirm the Nicene Council, and make two or three new canons.* But though it be certain and confessed by Binius and Baronius, that Constantine was not then at Rome, though the style be barbarous, and the matter frivolous, and the thing be a manifest forgery, contrived to carry on the grand cheat of Sylvester's confirming the Council of Nice ; yet Baronius and Binius (who confess the title to be false) labour to prove this Synod to be true, though Binius be forced to justify it by the forged letter of the Nicene Fathers to Sylvester, and his answer to them ; both which, in the next column, he owns are false and feigned.† And thus where the supremacy is concerned, one forgery serves for the evidence of another.

The Council at Gangra is genuine, and was an uncorrupted remain of primitive antiquity, till it fell into the hands of these editors, who have put the name of Osius, bishop of Corduba, into the title in their Latin version ; and though that name be not found in the original Greek printed over against it ; yet from this fiction of their own,‡ the notes impudently say, that this synod was convened by Sylvester's authority ; and from Osius's presence in it Binius certainly gathers it was celebrated under this Pope ; but a little after he knows not in what year it was held ; and Baronius treats of this Council, A. D. 361, that is, near thirty years after Sylvester's death.§ They tell us that Pope Symmachus, in his sixth Roman Council, approves this synod, but he mentions not Osius ; however, Baronius guesses, that the reason why Symmachus approved it was, "because Osius, the legate of the apostolic see, was there : " which groundless conjecture and false assertion Binius in his

* Lab. p. 412. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 365. col. 1. Baron. An. 325. §. 199. [Ibid. p. 154. col. 1.]

† Bin. p. 365. col. 2. C.

‡ Lab. p. 414. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 366. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 427, 428. Bin. p. 371. col. 1. Baron. An. 361. §. 44. [Ibid. vol. 5. p. 29. col. 1.]

notes turns into a positive affirmation, *vis.* that Osius was there as the Pope's legate. As to the occasion of calling this Council of Gangra, it was to condemn one Eustathius, whom Binius owns to have been a great favourer of monkish life; and Sozomon saith he was a monk;* yea, the synodical epistle describes him as one who despised marriage, allowed not the administrations of married priests, who had a separate way of worship, and a different garb from others, making his followers to abstain from flesh, profess continency and renounce propriety;† all which are the very characters of a monk of the Roman stamp; and therefore it is wonder that Binius should give Sozomen and himself the lie, and say he was no propagator of monkery, and that it cannot be proved that he was a monk; yet at last he fancies Eustathius's name was mistaken for Eutachus an Armenian monk.‡ All which blunders are only designed to keep the reader from observing, that a monk was condemned for a heretic, yea, and censured for holding those very opinions, which now pass current among the Romish friars. For which end also, in his notes on the fourth canon, he saith, "the heretics (that is, Protestants) foolishly apply this canon to condemn the celibacy of the clergy; whereas (he saith) it doth not concern priests who have wives, but such as had wives."§ But I doubt it will prove the Romanists are the heretics here; for both this canon and the synodical epistle have *γεγαμηκότος*, which signifies a priest who now hath a wife; even as *τοῖς γεγαμηκόσι*, 1 Cor. vii. 10, is those that have wives, and are actually married; and so the best version of this canon is *presbyterum conjugatum*: for by it all those are anathematized, who affirm, that men should not communicate if a married priest say the office; that is, this primitive Council anathematizes the modern Church of Rome, to hide the shame of which just censure, the notes quarrel with our preferring the translation of their friend Dionysius, who turns the word *λειτουργισατος*, *ministrante*, before those versions which turn it by *sacrificante*, as if Protestants did this out of a design to blot out the memorial of the unbloody sacrifice;|| whereas that Greek word doth properly signify ministering and saying the offices of the Church, but no where is used properly for sacrificing; and it is apparent, that

* Sozom. lib. 3. cap. 13.

† Bin. p. 367, &c.

‡ Lab. p. 429. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 371. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 430. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 372. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 431. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 372. col. 2.

Protestants do most religiously believe the sacrament to be an unbloody sacrifice, and as such do make it a memorial of Christ's own bloody sacrifice upon the cross.

The notes also blame these Eustathian heretics for "persuading the people to give them the dispensing of their alms intended for the poor, contrary (saith Binius) to the Apostles' doctrine and constitution."* Yet thus the Romish friars do at this day, drawing the people's alms to their convents, under pretence of being dispensers of them. The same notes are mistaken in saying, "that the Manicheans were forbid by their doctrine to give any alms to the poor:" for St. Augustine (who knew those heretics best) affirms, "that they only forbade their people to give meat or fruits—to any beggar who was not of their own sect."† Lastly, whereas this Council condemns the Eustathians, for "abhorring the assemblies and divine offices used in the places where the martyrs were commemorated," Can. ult. these notes falsely pretend they were condemned for disapproving the worship and invocation of the holy martyrs;‡ whereas it is plain by the canon, that the martyrs were only commemorated, not invoked nor worshipped in those days; and the expression in this place is only a phrase to signify the usual assemblies of orthodox Christians, which were then frequently held in the burying-places of the martyrs, and these heretics separated from those public assemblies.

The Arians, to revenge their condemnation at Nice,§ falsely accuse Athanasius to the Emperor Constantine, who thereupon called a Council at Tyre, which these editors entitle, The Council of Tyre under Sylvester.|| Yet all the ancients agree the Emperor called it, and their own notes confess as much; only they pretend, he called this Council contrary to custom and his duty: but this is notoriously false, since Constantine had already called divers Councils, and particularly that of Nice. And as for Pope Sylvester, he is not once named in this Council of Tyre, which looks a little oddly upon the pretended supremacy, that when the Catholic cause lay at the stake, we never hear one word of the Roman Bishop, neither in this Council, nor in all the succeeding letters and Councils relating to Athanasius,

* Lab. et Bin. ut supra.

† Aug. de Mor. Manich. lib. 2. tom. i. p. 177.

‡ Lab. p. 434. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 374. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 435. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 374. col. 1.

§ An. Dom. 335.

till that cause was afterward brought before the Pope, as an arbitrator chosen by both parties.

§. 19. Pope Marcus succeeded Sylvester,* and sat about eight months; yet, that he might not seem to have done nothing, the forgers have invented an epistle from Athanasius to this Pope, desiring a true copy of the Nicene Canons from Rome, on pretence that the Arians had burned theirs at Alexandria: to which is annexed Marcus's answer, who saith he had sent him seventy canons. Now Binius had often cited these epistles to prove the Pope's supremacy and infallibility, and to shew there were more than twenty canons made at Nice; yet here his notes bring five substantial reasons to prove these epistles forged; and Labbé notes, "these wares of Isidore are justly suspected by Baronius, Bellarmine, and other skilful Catholics:" nor doth Binius himself doubt of their being spurious.† Yea, it is remarkable, that this very Binius out of Baronius here confesseth,‡ "that he who forged the epistle of Boniface to Eulalius, devised also these two epistles, to consult the credit of Pope Zosimus and Pope Boniface, who had cited a canon out of the Nicene Council, not found among the genuine twenty canons." From which we may observe, first, that Binius will cite those things for the supremacy, &c. which he knows to be forged. Secondly, that the great design of all these forged records of antiquity was either to cover the faults, or consult the honour of the Roman Church; which seems to have both employed and encouraged the authors of these pious frauds, because her pretences could not be made out by any thing that was authentic.

Julius succeeded Marcus in the same year, in whose life the Pontifical mistakes the consuls' names, and feigns he was banished ten months, which Baronius proves to have been impossible.§ He fills up this Pope's story (according to his manner) with trifling matters, and omits the only remarkable thing in his life, which was his concern in the cause of Athanasius. In this Pope's name several epistles are published: the first from Julius to the Eastern bishops may be proved fictitious, not only by the confession of Baronius and other learned Romanists,|| but by divers other arguments. For is

* An. Dom. 336.

† Lab. p. 469, et 472. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 382. col. 2. &c.

‡ Baron. An. 336. §. 59, et 60. [ut supra, vol. 4. p. 290. col. 2.]

§ Baron. An. 352. §. 2, et 3. [Ibid. p. 505.]

|| Lab. p. 475. in marg. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 384. col. 1.

it probable, that Julius would only be solicitous about his supremacy, when he writ to the Arians, and not once reprove them for their heresy, nor their persecuting Athanasius? Is it likely he should cite the Council of Nice falsely, and feign so many ancient decrees about the primacy of the Pope, and the nullity of Councils not celebrated by his authority? This forger saith, Julius consented to the Nicene Council at the time of its celebration; but the Romanists agree that it was held in Sylvester's time. He imperiously forbids the Eastern bishops to judge any bishops without him; and falsely tells them, they all had received their consecration from Rome; yea, with the fabulous Pontifical he mistakes the consul's name, and puts Maximianus for Titianus. Yet by this forgery the editors would prove, that more than twenty canons were made at Nice;* and (after Baronius had discarded it) Binius by frivolous notes strives to justify it, as speaking big for the supremacy.† Secondly, here is the Eastern bishops' answer to Julius: wherein, though they call the Pope Father, which was the usual title of bishops of great sees, yet they expressly deny his having any authority over them, and affirm he ought to be subject to the canons, as well as other bishops: so that there is no reason for Binius's brag, "lo, how they own the supremacy!"‡ For indeed they do not own it at all; and yet the substance of this epistle is genuine, being found in Socrates and Sozomen. The third epistle from Julius to the Arians is owned by Baronius and others to be a forgery;§ and Binius in his notes upon it saith, "it is false, corrupted, and stolen out of divers authors;"|| yet the same Binius infamously quotes it over and over for the supremacy, the nullity of Councils not called by the Pope, and the number of the Nicene Canons. The fourth epistle of Julius comes not out of the Vatican, but was preserved in Athanasius's Apology, and is by all accounted genuine, being writ in a humble style, without any pretences to the supremacy.¶ And here the Nicene canon (about the rehearing, in a new Synod, a cause not well judged before) is rightly cited, without mention of any final

* Lab. Marg. p. 477. Bin. p. 385. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 480. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 386. col. 1.

‡ Lab. Marg. p. 482. Bin. p. 386. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 483. Bin. p. 387. col. 2.

|| Bin. p. 391. col. 1.

¶ Lab. p. 494. [ut supra.] Bia. p. 391. col. 1.

appeal to Rome :* the power of all bishops is supposed to be equal, and not any greater power to belong to him that is fixed in a greater city. Here Julius writes not his own sense, but the sense of the bishops of Italy, who were assembled in a Synod at Rome: of which great city Julius being bishop, ought, by ancient custom, to publish the decrees of such Councils as were held in or near that city :† but Binius falsely infers from hence, “that it was an honour due to his place, to publish the decrees made in all Synods.” And whereas, when any thing was under debate concerning Alexandria (the second patriarchate) Julius saith, it was a custom to write to the Roman Bishop (who was the first patriarch) Binius, stretcheth this and saith, “It was both agreeable to the canons and custom, that no bishop should be judged till the Pope’s definitive sentence were heard.”‡ The last epistle also is genuine, and writ in a modest style, owning that Athanasius was not judged by the Pope alone, but by a Synod of Bishops, whose judgment he supposes above his own ;§ and by these two epistles we may discern the impostures of those other epistles, which are forged about this time in the names of this and other Popes. The decrees attributed to this Pope are not suitable to the age ; yet we may note, the third decree “forbids a man to marry his deceased brother’s wife, though his brother had not known her ;” which was shamefully broken by that Pope, who gave licence to King Henry VIII. to marry his brother’s wife ; and this decree justifies his divorce.||

After these epistles follows a Roman Synod, wherein Julius with 117 bishops confirm the Nicene Council ; but Labbé saith, it is a hotch-potch made up out of many authors, and put into the form of a Council by Isidore,¶ and it is dated with the same mistaken consuls Felician and Maximian, with which Julius’s entrance into the Pontifical, and all his forged epistles are dated (for his genuine epistles have no date) ; yet Baronius** and the notes gravely dispute about the time of this forged Council, and the bishops which were said to be in it ; merely to persuade the reader, that the Nicene Council needed the Pope’s

* Lab. p. 495. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. ut supra, col. 2.

† Lab. p. 513. [ut supra] Bin p. 395. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 516. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 396. col. 1.

§ Ep. 4. ap. Lab. Bin. p. 396. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 525. [ut supra.] Bin p. 398. col. 1.

¶ Lab. Marg. p. 527. Bin. p. 400. col. 1.

** Baron. An. 337. §. 67. [ut supra, p. 317.]

confirmation; but since this Council is feigned, it can be no evidence: and therefore Binius gains nothing, by alleging it in his notes on the third epistle, but only to shew us, that one falsehood is the fittest prop for another.

§. 20. Athanasius, being restored to Alexandria,* calls a Synod there of all the bishops of his province, of which only the synodical epistle is now extant, written, as the title declares, "to all the catholic bishops everywhere;" yet the notes from Baronius say,† "it was writ particularly to Julius;" whereas the body of the epistle saith, "The Arians have written to the Roman bishop, and perhaps (speaking to other bishops) they have writ to you also:" so that this is a falsehood devised for to make out the supremacy, which is not countenanced by this epistle wherein we are told that "religion depends not on the greatness of any city;" though the notes say, "that bishops had honours and jurisdiction given them, suiting to the dignity of the secular prefects of their several cities;" and thence Alexandria was reckoned the second patriarchate, and Antioch the third;‡ it follows naturally, therefore, Rome was the first patriarchate: but this inference they will not make: I shall only note, that this Synod saith, "the lawful use of the cup of the Lord was to make the people drink:"§ from whence we gather, that the Roman Church (who denies the cup to the people) doth a very unlawful thing, and leaves off the lawful use of the holy chalice.

The Council of Antioch|| is by the editors said to be held under Julius,¶ yet it was called by Constantius, on occasion of dedicating a new church there; and the notes say, the Emperor not only called it, but being present there, caused such decrees as he pleased to pass in it:** yea, it is evident they valued Pope Julius so little, that they judged quite otherwise than he had done in the case of Athanasius, and therefore the Romanists rail at this Synod as a conventicle of Arians, and in the last Roman edition, saith Richerius,†† have left out these canons as not favouring the practice of the Roman Court.

* An. Dom. 339.

† Baron. An. 339. §. 2, et 11. [Ibid. p. 333, 336.]

‡ Lab. p. 534. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 401. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 547. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 404. col. 1.

|| An. Dom. 341.

¶ Lab. p. 559. Bin. p. 407.

** Lab. p. 588. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 416. col. 1.

†† Richer. Histor. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 4.

However Baronius saith, among 97 bishops, only 36 were Arians;* and the canons made here are excellent rules for discipline, having been received into the code of the universal Church before St. Chrysostom's time, confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon, allowed by St. Hilary, and (as Gratian saith) received by the Catholics: and the learned Richerius hath fully answered all the cavils of Binius and Baronius, by which they would invalidate them: so that we need only make some few remarks on this Council, and so dismiss it. The twelfth canon "orders a bishop who was deposed, to appeal to a Synod of bishops, and allowed none to be restored, unless it were by a greater number of bishops than had deposed him."† But they exclaim against it as a device of the Arians, "to take away that apostolical and ancient law and custom of appealing to Rome, which," they say, "was always observed till now." But hitherto they could never produce any such law, nor prove any such custom; nor did St. Chrysostom ever appeal to Rome, but desired to be restored by a greater Synod as this canon requires;‡ and when his enemies made that impossible, then indeed he objected that this canon was made by Arians; yet the canon remained in force, and was generally received in that age. Nor did the Sardican Council revoke it (as Binius falsely saith):§ for they put a new compliment on the Pope, yet did they not take away the ancient method of appealing from a lesser Synod to a greater. The second canon decrees, "that such as come to church to hear part of the service, and do not receive the sacrament, shall be excommunicated." This the notes say was to condemn the old Audian heretics;|| but it evidently condemns the new Roman heretics, who since they exalted their wafer into a god, expect the people should only gaze at and adore it most part of the year, and excuse them, though they often go away without receiving it. The twenty-fifth canon "forbids bishops to commit the treasures and fruits of the church to their kinsmen, brethren, and sons." Upon which Binius hath no note, knowing it reflected on the Roman Church's custom, where the Popes generally give all they can to their scandalous *Nipotismo*.

* Baron. An. 341. §. 4, et 5. [ut supra, p. 361, 362.]

† Lab. p. 595. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 417. col. 2.

‡ Socrat. lib. 6. cap. 16. Vid. Bever. Concil. tom. 2. p. 191.

§ Lab. p. 597. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 418. col. 2. Vid. Richer. ut supra.

|| Lab. p. 596. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 418. col. 1.

Next to this Council of Antioch, is placed a second Synod at Rome under Pope Julius, in the cause of Athanasius;* but Baronius places it before that of Antioch, A.D. 340. §. 1. And though the Cardinal confess, that Athanasius and his enemies by consent had referred this matter to Julius's arbitration, and that Athanasius came to Rome after this reference was made; yet he vainly remarks on this matter in these words, "Behold, reader, the ancient usage for injured bishops, to come even out of the East to the Roman Bishop for redress."† But this is one of the first instances, and was a mere arbitration by consent; and the ancient usage, since the Emperors became Christians, was to appeal to them, as these parties had done, before it was referred to the Pope. In this Roman Council it is pretended Athanasius delivered his Creed; but the acts of the Council being lost, and the Roman archives being a repository neither safe nor creditable, we can have no evidence from thence of the truth and antiquity of this excellent composure. One thing however is remarkable, that Baronius and Binius charge the Greeks with taking away those words "and the Son" out of this Creed, and add, "that they falsely pretended, this was a late addition of the Latins."‡ Yet Baronius himself owns, that the Western Church added these words "and the Son" to the Nicene Creed, above a hundred years after; § so that they accuse the poor Greeks for keeping the Creed as Athanasius made it, and as their own Church used to recite the Nicene Creed for many years after.

The year following, Julius held a third Synod at Rome,|| and in it read the letter of the Eastern bishops, wherein they wonder he should cite them to Rome, and so value himself upon the greatness of his city, as on that account to take upon him to judge them concerning things which they had determined in their own Synods. Nor durst Julius challenge any authority over them, by reason of the eminence of his city:¶ only he pleads for Athanasius, who being bishop of an apostolical see, *viz.* Alexandria, ought not to have been condemned by them, till they had writ to all the Western bishops, and especially to him as bishop of the first see, that so all of them (*viz.* in Council) might have determined the matter according

* Lab. p. 604. [vol 2. Lut. Par 1671.] Bin. p. 419. col. 1.

† Baron. An. 340. §. 2. [Ibid. p. 340.]

‡ Lab. p. 605. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 420. col. 1. Baron. An. 340. §. 12.

§ Baron. An. 447.

|| An. Dom. 342.

¶ Baron. An. 341. §. 56, 57. [Ibid. p. 383.]

to right.* But Baronius and Binius turn this into their being obliged to write to the Pope, and to receive what he had defined. † And Binius infers, from the Pope's writing this synodical letter from a Council held in his own city of Rome (though the Synod expressly command him to write the epistle), "that in respect to the Pope, and according to ancient custom, it was his right to publish whatever was agreed on in Council."† But such false consequences from premises that will not bear them, only shew the arguer's partiality.

After this we have nothing remarkable, but a second Council at Antioch, held by the Arians; yet bearing this title, Under Julius,‡ wherein the Arians made a new Creed, and sent four bishops to give Constans the Emperor, and all the Western bishops, an account of their faith, and they met these legates in a Council at Milan; and though it doth not appear Julius was present, yet Baronius makes as if this embassy from the East was sent to Julius, chiefly to desire communion with him;§ and Binius saith, "they desired to be received into the communion of the Roman Church."|| But the ancient historians assure us, they desired not the communion of the Roman only, but of the whole Western Church, of which that was then esteemed no more than one eminent part.

§. 21. The Sardican Synod,¶ which saith some kind things of Rome, is prodigiously magnified by the editors, who place a history before it, and partial notes after it, which are full of fallacies and designed misrepresentations. Baronius also spends one whole year in setting it off to the best advantage; but all their frauds will be discovered, by considering, first, by whom it was called: secondly, who presided in it: thirdly, of what number of bishops it consisted: and, fourthly, what authority the canons of it have.

First, As to the calling it, the preface falsely states the occasion thereof: for it is plain Athanasius did not (as that reports) "leave the whole judgment of his cause to the Pope;"** nor did he (as is here said) fly to Rome, as the mother of all churches, and the rock of faith. This is the prefacer's mere invention: for Athanasius went to Rome, as

* Id. An. 342. §. 28, 30. [Ibid. p. 393, 394.]

† Lab. p. 607. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 420. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 608. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 420. col. 2.

§ Baron. An. 344. §. 4. [Ibid. p. 410.]

|| Lab. p. 614. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 422. col. 1.

** Lab. p. 624. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 423.

¶ An. Dom. 347.

to the place agreed on by both sides for arbitrating this matter; and the other party so little valued the Pope's decision in his favour, that they would neither restore Athanasius, nor receive him into communion upon it; which made Julius complain to the Emperor Constans, who writ to his brother Constantius about it; but that letter did not produce this Council (as the preface fully sets out), but only procured a fruitless embassy of three Eastern bishops to Rome. It was the personal addresses of Athanasius and Paulus, bishop of Constantinople, to Constans (when they found the Pope had no power to restore them), which caused both the Emperors to give order for this Council to meet, as Sozomen, Socrates, and Theodoret affirm.* And the bishops in their epistles do expressly say, "they were called by the most religious Emperor:"† but Baronius fraudulently leaves out this beginning of the bishops' letter;‡ and the bold writer of the preface saith, "this Council was called by the Pope's authority:" and the notes offer some reasons to justify this falsehood; yea, they cite the aforesaid authors, who plainly declare it was called by both the Emperors, to prove it was called by the Pope; but they offer nothing material to make this out. It is true, Socrates saith, "some absent bishops complained of the shortness of time, and blamed Julius for it;"§ but that doth not prove the Council was called by his authority, only it supposes he might advise the Emperor to make them meet speedily; but still that is no sign of full power.

Secondly, As to the president of this Council, the preface saith boldly, that Hosius, Archidamus, and Philoxenus presided in the name of Julius. But, first, it doth not appear that Hosius was the Pope's legate, only as an eminent confessor he had a chief place in it; whence Sozomen saith, "Hosius and Protogenes were chief of the Western bishops here assembled:"|| that is, Hosius as an ancient confessor, and Protogenes as bishop of Sardica, where the Council was held; but as for Archidamus and Philoxenus, they are not in the Latin copies of the subscribers ¶ And Athanasius only saith, "Julius subscribed by these two presbyters;" which shews that Hosius was

* Sozom. lib. 3. cap. 19. Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 16. Theod. lib. 2. cap. 5.

† Lab. p. 670. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 440.

‡ Baron. An. 347. §. 31. [Ibid. p. 432, 433.]

§ Not. ad Concil. Sardic. Lab. p. 685. Bin. p. 445. col. 1. Vid. Richer. Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 3. [p. 44. Col. 1683.]

|| Sozom. lib. 3. cap. 11. ¶ Lab. p. 658. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 436. col. 1.

not the Pope's legate (for he subscribed in his own name), and that these presbyters, who were his legates, were not presidents of the Council.

Thirdly, They magnify the number of bishops also in this Synod, to make it look like a General Council ; where accounts differ, they take the largest,* and falsely cite Athanasius, as if he said it consisted of 376 bishops, and so exceeded the first Council of Nice :† whereas Athanasius expressly reckons only 170, who met at the city of Sardica ;‡ and when many of the Eastern bishops withdrew, there were not one hundred left to pass the decrees of this Council. It is true, Athanasius affirms, that 344 bishops signed the decree to restore him ; but many of these hands were got from orthodox bishops who were not at the Council :§ so that this was never counted or called a General Council by any, but these partial Romanists ; for though the Emperor seemed to have designed it general at first,|| yet so few came to it, and they who came agreed so ill (the Eastern bishops generally forsaking it), that it is called frequently, a Council of the Western Church ; and so Epiphanius in Baronius describes it.¶

Fourthly, The little regard paid to its canons afterwards shews it was no General Council. Richerius, a moderate and learned Romanist, proves that this Council was not extant in Greek in the time of Dionysius Exiguus, so that he and Pope Leo IV. reckon it after all the Councils of note. The Greeks received not its canons into their code ; and Pope Nicholas's epistle shews, that the Eastern Church did not value its authority ; only the Popes esteemed it, because it seems to advance their power.** The African Church of old valued this Council as little ; for a Synod of bishops there (among whom were St. Augustine and Alypius) were ignorant of any Sardican Council, but one held by the Arians. Baronius tries all his art to palliate this matter ;†† but after all his conjectures, it is plain it was of no repute in Africa, because when two Popes, Zosimus

* Baron. An. 347. §. 3, 4. [Ibid. p. 424, 425.]

† Lab. p. 685. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 446. col. 1. Baron. ut supra. §. 75. [Ibid. p. 448.]

‡ Athanas. Epist. ad Solitar. p. 818.

§ Idem. Apol. 2. p. 767, et 768.

|| Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 16.

¶ Baron. An. 347. §. 42.

** Richer. Hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 3.

†† Baron. An. 347. §. 73. [§. 79.] [Ibid. p. 449. col. 2.]

and Boniface, afterwards cited the decrees of Sardica as canons of Nice, the fraud was discovered ; and when they were found not to be Nicene canons, they would not receive them as canons of Sardica, but flatly rejected them ; which shews that these African Fathers did neither take this Sardican synod for a General Council, nor for an authentic provincial Council. And therefore whatever is here said in favour of the Roman Church, if of no great weight. However, the champions of Rome magnify the fourth canon of this Council, where in case a bishop judge that he is condemned unjustly, Hosius saith, "if it please you, let us honour the memory of Peter the Apostle, and let those who have judged such a bishop, write to Julius, bishop of Rome, that so (if need be) the judgment may be reviewed by the bishops of the province, and he may appoint some to hear the cause," &c. Now here the notes talk big, and claim a supremacy and appeals due to the Pope by divine right :* but Richerius well observes, "it is nonsense to ascribe that to a human law and privilege, or to the decree of a Council, which was due before to the Pope by the law of God."† And we add, that Hosius neither cites any divine law, no nor any precedent canon or custom for this, but supposes it at the pleasure of this Synod to grant or deny Julius this privilege : and yet if it were an express law, this being only a Western synod, doth not bind the whole catholic Church. Besides, it is not said, "the criminal shall appeal to Rome, and have his cause tried there ;" but only, that the Pope (if need were) might order the cause to be heard over again in the province where it was first tried ; and therefore Julius is only made a judge of the necessity of a rehearing, not of the cause itself, which, according to the fifth canon of Nice, was to be decided in the province where it was first moved. And this rather condemns than countenances the modern Popish way of trying foreign causes at Rome by appeal. To this I will add an ancient scholion on this canon found in some old copies : "From this canon the Roman Church is much exalted with pride ; and former evil Popes producing this as a canon of Nice, were discovered by a Council at Carthage, as the preface to that Council shews : but this canon (whatever they pretend) gives no more power to Rome than other canons, since it saith not absolutely, that any who is deposed any where, shall have

* Lab. p. 690, et 691. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 448. col. 1.

† Richer. Hist. Con. lib. 1. cap. 3.

liberty to appeal to the Pope; for at that rate, the Sardican Synod would contradict the General Councils; it speaks only of him who is deposed by the neighbouring bishops, and those of his province, and therefore doth not comprehend the synod of the primate, metropolitan, or patriarch; so that if they be present, and the sentence be not barely by the neighbouring bishops, the Pope may not rehear it, as this canon orders: and it only concerns those in the West, Hosius and the makers of these canons being of those parts; but in the East this custom never was observed to this day.”* I shall make one remark or two more, and so dismiss this Council. The preface cites Sozomen, to prove that Hosius and others writ to Julius to confirm these canons; but Sozomen only saith, “They writ to him, to satisfy him that they had not contradicted the Nicene canons;”† and their epistle (which calls Julius their fellow-minister)‡ desires him to publish their decrees to those in Sicily, Sardinia, and Italy (which of old were suburbicarian regions), but never speaks of his confirming their decrees.§ Yet in their epistle to the church of Alexandria, they pray them to give their suffrage to the Council’s determination:|| which, had it been writ to the Pope, would have made his creatures sufficiently triumph. I observe also, that upon the mention of the church of Thessalonica in the twentieth canon, the notes pretend, that this church had an especial regard then, because the bishop of it was the Pope’s legate; yet the first proof they give is, that Pope Leo made Athanasius of Thessalonica his legate a hundred years after; and hence (they say) “Bellarmine aptly proves the Pope’s supremacy:”¶ but the inferences are as ridiculous as they are false, and they get no advantage either to their supremacy or appeals by this Council.

§ 22. The first Council of Carthage was appointed to suppress that dangerous sect of the Donatists,** and though it bear the title of Under Julius, yet this pretended universal monarch is not mentioned by the Council, or by any ancient author, as having any hand in this great work, which was

* Schol. ap. Bever. Conc. tom. 2. p. 199.

† Sozom. lib. 3. cap. 11. Lab. p. 625. Bin. p. 424.

‡ Lab. p. 670. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 440. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 662. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 437. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 670. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 439. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 692. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 448. col. 2.

** A.D. 348.

managed by Gratus, bishop of Carthage, and by the Emperor's legates.* In this Council were made fourteen excellent canons, which possibly the Romanists may reject, because they never asked the Pope's consent to hold this Council, nor desired his confirmation to their canons, and whereas the editors tell us, Pope Leo IV. (who lived five hundred years after) approved of this Council, we must observe that the Catholic Church had put them into their code, and received them for authentic long before, without staying for any approbation from the Bishop of Rome.

Soon after this there was a Council at Milan, of which there was no mention but only in the synodical letter of the bishops met at Ariminum, A.D. 359;† who say, that the presbyters of Rome were present at it; they say not, "presidents of it:" and there it seems Ursacius and Valens, two Arian heretics, abjured their heresy, and recanted their false evidence against Athanasius. And either before or after this Synod (it is not certain whether) they went to Rome, and in writing delivered their recantation to Pope Julius,‡ before whom they had falsely accused Athanasius, and who was the arbitrator chosen to hear that cause; and so not as Pope, but as a chosen judge in that case, was fittest to receive these men's confessions; yet hence the notes make this inference, "that since this matter was greater, than that a Synod at Milan (though the Roman presbyters were present) could dispatch it; and lest the ancient custom of the catholic Church should be broken, *viz.* for eminent heretics to abjure their heresies only at Rome, and be received into communion by the Pope, they sent them to Julius, that having before him offered their penitential letter, they might make their confession, the whole Roman Church looking on." All which is their own invention; for the authors from whom alone they have the notice of this Council, say nothing of this kind, and it is very certain that there was at this time no custom at all for heretics to abjure at Rome more than at any other place, many heretics being frequently reconciled at other churches. There was also a peculiar reason why these two heretics went thither, and it cannot be proved that this Council sent them; so that these are forgeries devised to support their dear supremacy, and so we leave them, only

* Lab. p. 713. Bin. p. 546. col. 1.

† Baron. An. 359. § 16. [ut supra, p. 632. col. 1.] Lab. p. 721. Bin. p. 459. col. 1.

‡ Hœmii Epist. ap. Baron. An. 355. §. 661. [§. 64.] [Ibid. p. 552.]

noting, that the editors are not so happy in their memory as their invention; for the next page shews us a Council of Jerusalem, wherein many bishops (who had subscribed the condemnation of Athanasius, and therefore no doubt were Arians) repented and recanted, and so were restored to the Church's communion, without the trouble of going to Rome on this errand.

A Council at Colen follows next, which they say was in Julius's time, and under Julius; yet the notes say, they know not the time when it was held, only the bishops there assembled deposed a bishop for heresy by their own authority, without staying for the Pope's advice, though they were then about to send a message to Rome to pray for it, so little was the Pope's consent thought needful in that age; and perhaps it is in order to conceal this seeming neglect, that the notes (after they have approved far more improbable stories which make for the honour of their Church) reject the report of this message to the Prince of the Apostles as fabulous;* and we are not concerned to vindicate it.

The last Council, which they style Under Julius, was at Vasatis, or Bazas in France; yet the notes affirm, "that Nectarius presided in it;" the time of it is very uncertain,† and the phrases used in the canons of it, shew it to be of much later date. Besides, this Council saith, "the *Gloria Patri* was sung after the Psalms in all the Eastern churches;" but John Cassian, who came out of the East in the next century, saith, "he had never heard this hymn sung after the Psalms in the Eastern churches;"‡ wherefore it is probable this Council was celebrated after Cassian's time, when the Greek churches had learned this custom; and yet these editors place it a whole century too soon, because they would have us think that custom here mentioned, "of remembering the Pope in their daily prayers," was as ancient as the wrong date here assigned. In Labbé's editions here is added an account of three Councils against Photinus,§ on which we need make no remarks.

§. 23. Pope Liberius succeeded Julius,|| whose life with the notes upon it are very diverting, if we observe the shifts and artifices used by the Roman parasites to excuse him from

* Bin. not. p. 463. col. 2.

† Lab p. 728. Bin. p. 464. col. 1 et 2.

‡ Bin. not. in epist. Damas. et Hieron. p. 506. col. 1.

§ Lab. ap. 729, ad p. 739.

|| A.D. 352.

heresy. The Pontifical saith, "he was banished three years by Constantius, for not consenting to the Arians, in whose place Felix was ordained, and he in a Council condemned Ursacius and Valens, two Arian bishops, who in revenge petitioned Constantius to revoke Liberius; and he being thus restored, consented to the Arians and the Emperor, so far as to persecute and martyr the Catholics; and his rival Felix, being a Catholic, was deposed." But this fable is not fine enough for the palates of Baronius and Binius, who are to dress a story to make the reader believe, that neither Liberius nor Felix erred in faith while they were Popes. To confute which, let it be considered, that Binius confesseth Liberius consented to the depriving of Athanasius, admitted Arians to his communion, and subscribed an Arian confession of faith; as Athanasius, Hilary, and Jerome witness;* and there are arguments unanswerable to prove, he was an Arian while he was Pope;† yea, Binius in his own notes twice confesseth, "that he unhappily fell;‡ and that he basely fell:"§ yet, to mince the matter, he adds, "that by his fall he cast a vile blot on his life and manners;" and the notes on the Sirnian Council say, "by offending against the confession of faith, and the law of justice, he cast a most base blot on his life and manners."|| What can be more ridiculous! He erred in faith, and subscribed the Arian confession, therefore the blot was upon his faith; this did not concern his life and manners. That absurd phrase is a mere blind to keep the reader from discovering a Pope turning heretic: to which end they impudently say, "it is a false calumny of the heretics to say, Liberius was infected with the Arian heresy."¶ But I ask, whether Athanasius, St. Hilary, and St. Jerome (who affirm this) were heretics? Or was Platina a heretic, who saith, "Liberius did in all things agree with the heretics?" To which the same forgers have added, "as some would have it;" but those are not Photinus's words, who saith soon after, "he was of the same opinion with the Arians."** And surely the catholic people of Rome, in

* Not. ad 7 Epist. Liber. Lab. p. 751. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 470. col. 1.

† Vid. Spalat. de Rep. Ecol. lib. 7. c. 5.

‡ Lab. p. 741. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 465. E.

§ Lab. p. 743. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 466. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 783. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 479. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 741. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 465. col. 2.

** Platin. in vit Liber. p. 50. Eusebius Presbyter urbis Romæ cepit declarare Liberium Hæreticum. Portitor. Sarisb. Aug. 14.

his time, took him for an Arian, and as such would have no communion with him, and therefore we conclude he was an Arian. As for Felix, who was put into his place, Baronius and Binius would excuse him by a false Latin version of Socrates, saying, "he was addicted to the Arian sect;" but the original Greek expressly declares, "he was in opinion an Arian."* And it is certain, he was chosen by the Arians, and communicated with them, ordaining Arians to be priests; and therefore the Catholic people at Rome avoided his communion; and St. Jerome saith, "he was an Arian." As for the story of his condemning Ursacius and Valens, two of that sect, there is no better authority for it than the fabulous Pontifical. So that after all the devices of Bellarmine, Baronius and Binius to save their Church's infallibility,† we have two Popes at once falling so notoriously into the Arian heresy, that the lay people disowned their communion. This is more than suspicion of heresy in St. Peter's chair, and proves that their infallible guides for some years were Arian heretics.

For this Liberius divers epistles are published, with a preface before them; which saith, "two of them were feigned by the Arians;"‡ yet these two are found in the fragments of St. Hilary, among which it is not probable there should be any fiction of the Arians. So that it is very likely these two epistles are genuine, but rejected by these sycophants of Rome, because they tell us an ungrateful truth, *viz.* that Liberius did condemn Athanasius soon after he was made Pope. And if we consider how inconstant he was, it is very probable that he might condemn Athanasius twice, first in the beginning of his Papacy, as is said in these two epistles, of which he repented, and then writ that tenth epistle to own he was in communion with Athanasius, and to tell him, if he approved of his form of faith, it would tend much to the settling of his judgment,§ which is an odd compliment from an infallible head. Secondly, he condemned Athanasius after his banishment, of which more shall be said hereafter: but as to the particular epistles we shall note, that in the first (which they say is genuine) Liberius with other bishops petitioned Constantinus to order a Council to be held at Aquileia;|| by which we see the Pope had not then assumed the power of calling

* Τῇ Ἀπειρανῷ Δόξῃ Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 29.

† Lab. p. 742. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 466. col. 1, et 2.

‡ Lab. p. 744. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 467. col. 1.

§ Lab. p. 755. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 471. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 744. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 467. col. 1 Vid. item Ep. 2

Councils. When he writ the seventh epistle (which they grant also to be genuine), no doubt he was an Arian; for he calls the Arian bishops his most beloved brethren, and declares his consent to their just condemning of Athanasius, together with his being in communion with them, and his receiving their Sirmian Creed as the catholic faith.* So in the eleventh epistle (which is certainly genuine and recorded by Socrates),† the notes confess "he was so easy as to receive the semi-Arians to communion, and to commend their faith as the same which was decreed at Nice:" but it is gross flattery to call this only being too easy; it was in plain terms being deceived and erring in matters of faith; which spoils their infallibility,‡ as it also doth their universal supremacy, for Liberius in the same epistle to call himself Bishop of Italy (referring only to the suburbicarian regions), and saying "he was the meanest of bishops," and rejoiced "that those in the East did (not submit to him, but) agree with him in matters of faith." Wherefore the twelfth, or (as Labbé calls it) the fourteenth epistle, which is writ to all bishops, is manifestly forged:§ and so are the two next from Liberius to Athanasius, and from Athanasius to Liberius, as both Labbé and Binius confess;|| yet in one of these the Pope brags of his authority over the universal Church: but the forger was so bad at chronology, that while he strives to make this Pope look like an orthodox friend of Athanasius, he absurdly brings him in, even under Julian and Valens (in one of whose reigns this epistle was written), threatening offenders with the Emperor's indignation, with deprivation, yea, with proscription, banishment, and stripes.¶ I need not mention those decrees which are attributed to Liberius whose style betrays them, and shews they belong to the later ages, and are placed here by the collectors only to make them seem more ancient than really they are.

In Liberius's first year, it is said, "there was a Council called at Rome by this Pope to clear Athanasius;"*** yet being sensible that their authority would signify very little, they all

* Lab. p. 751. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 469. col. 2.

† Socrat. Hist. lib. 4. c. 11.

‡ Lab. p. 757. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 472. col. 1.

§ Ep. 14. Lab. p. 760. [ut supra.] Ep. 12. Bin. p. 472. col. 2.

|| Lab. p. 763. [ut supra.] Bin. in Notis, p. 474. col. 2.

¶ Lab. p. 767. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 474. col. 2.

*** Lab. p. 769. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 475. col. 1.

agreed to petition the Emperor for a Council to meet at Aquileia, to confirm what they had done at Rome. A.D. 355, there was a Council at Milan, the editors call it a General Council, because it was with Constantius's permission called by Liberius, whose legates also were present at it.* But herein they grossly falsify, for Sozomen declares that Constantius summoned all the bishops to Milan;† and Baronius saith the Emperor called them together.‡ Therefore if this was a General Council, it was called by the Emperor, and not by the Pope. In the notes on this Synod they say Constantius, being yet a catechumen, ought not to be present at a lawful Council. But this is Baronius's device to colour over the forgery of Constantine's baptism before the Council of Nice, there being no canon forbidding a catechumen to be present in a Council or in a church, except only while the sacrament was celebrating; so that if Constantius had been bound by an ecclesiastical canon, there being no canon to hinder his presence in this Council, Baronius assigns a wrong cause of his absence. Again, the notes do very falsely suppose that Felix, though chosen by the Arians, was a catholic Pope;§ for he was ordained by three Arian bishops at Milan, as Athanasius declares: || and Socrates, as we noted before, saith, "he was in opinion an Arian." Nor is it probable, when the Arians had got Liberius banished for not complying with them, they should choose a catholic and an enemy into so eminent a see; or that the catholic people of Rome should avoid the communion of Felix if he were not an Arian. It is true Sozomen speaks of some who said he kept to the Nicene faith, and was unblameable in religion; yet he adds—"he was accused for ordaining Arians, and communicating with them."¶ But this bare report, raised perhaps by the Arians (who still pretended to be catholics, and hold the Nicene faith), cannot outweigh such strong reason and matters of fact as are here alleged to prove Felix not only a schismatical, but also an heretical Pope.

The dialogue between Constantius and Pope Liberius at Milan (here published) shews, that at this time he refused

* Lab. p. 772. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 476. col. 1.

† Sozom. lib. 4. c. 8. Socrat. lib. 2. c. 29.

‡ Baron. An. 355. §. 2. [ut supra, p. 536.]

§ Lab. p. 773. [ut supra.]

|| Athanas. Epist. ad Solitar.

¶ Sozom. lib. 4. c. 10.

either to condemn Athanasius or communicate with the Arians, and was banished into Thrace for this refusal : but the reader may justly wonder he should never mention his supremacy and universal authority, when Constantius asked him if he were so considerable a part of the world that he would alone stand for Athanasius; and when he advised him to embrace the communion of the churches,* how properly might he have here told him he was head of all churches, and those who did not communicate with him were no churches? Again, why doth this Pope offer to go to Alexandria, and hear Athanasius's cause there, which had been twiced judged at Rome? Surely he knew nothing of these last and highest appeals in all causes: the Popes of after ages claimed this as a right of their see; yet it must be granted that Liberius was ignorant of that privilege.

§. 24. The Council at Sirmium was called by Constantius,† and consisted of Arian bishops, who, though they condemned Photinus's gross heresy, yet would not put the word *consubstantial* into any of the three Creeds which they here composed; however the editors call it "a General Council partly rejected:" perhaps because Pope Liberius approved it, who here openly fell into the Arian heresy; and that not by constraint (as the notes pretend):‡ for out of his banishment he writ to the Eastern bishops, assuring them he had condemned Athanasius, and would communicate with them in their form of faith, and therefore he desired them to intercede for his release and restitution to his bishopric. The ambition of regaining which great place was the cause of his fall,§ as Baronius confesseth; and though that author had produced divers ancient writers expressly testifying that he subscribed heresy,|| yet a little after he again denies that Liberius was an heretic; pretending that he only signed the first confession of Sirmium, which was not downright heresy.¶ Though elsewhere he saith "Athanasius rejected all these Arian forms (which wanted *consubstantial*) as heretical;"** and declares that the catholic people of Rome esteemed Liberius to be an heretic, and would not have communion with him, for which

* Lab. p. 775. [vol 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 478. col. 1.

† A.D. 357.

‡ Lab. p. 783. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 479. col. 2.

§ Baron. An. 357. §. 33, 34, et 35. [Ibid. 603, 604.]

|| Baron. ibid. §. 32.

¶ Id. ibid. §. 37.

** Baron. An. 359. §. 10. [Ibid. p. 630. col. 2.]

he cruelly persecuted them. Nay, he brags of it as a singular providence, that Felix (who was a schismatical Pope in his exile), upon Liberius's fall, suddenly became a catholic and a lawful Pope, which still supposes Liberius was an heretic, as doth also Baronius's fiction of Liberius's speedy repentance, and Felix's dying soon after his adversary's return to Rome : for the writers of that age say Felix lived eight years after ;* and for Liberius's repentance, though many authors expressly speak of his falling into heresy, none are very clear in his returning, or, however, none suppose it to be so long before his death as Baronius doth ; whose design in this history is not to serve truth, but to clear St. Peter's chair from the imputation of heresy ; and therefore he makes this out chiefly by conjectures.† The testimonies of Damasus and Siricius, being parties and partial for the honour of their own see, are no good evidence, if they did speak of his early repentance ; but Damasus only saith, "the Bishop of Rome did not consent to the faith of Ariminum : " Baronius adds "this was Liberius." I reply, that Damasus was of Felix's party before his own advancement to be Pope, and so it is more probable that he meant Felix. Again, the catholic bishop's letter from Ariminum only says the Arian decrees created discord at Rome ;‡ that is, there were then two factions there, one of which (and probably that of Liberius) did agree to these decrees, the other rejected them. Baronius adds to the bishop's letter, "these decrees created factions, because the Pope of Rome opposed them : " but this will not clear Liberius, since both factions were headed by a Pope. Baronius goes on to tell us that Sozomen affirms Liberius was turned out of his church for not consenting to the faith at Ariminum.§ I answer, Sozomen must be mistaken in this, unless we feign a double exile of Liberius, which no good author mentions, and which Baronius will not allow. As for the epistle of Liberius to Athanasius, it was writ no doubt before he had condemned him, or else he ought to have confessed his fault as well as his faith to that great man. I grant Socrates doth say, that Liberius required the semi-Arians and Macedonians to consent to the Nicene faith in the time of Valens ;|| but this was nine years after his return, and not long before his death ; yet then Liberius was

* Marcellin. ad Faust. et Hieron Chronic.

† Baron. An. 357. §. 59. — ad — §. 63. [Ibid. p. 612, 613.]

‡ Sozom. lib. 4. c. 17. § Id. c. 18. || Socrat. lib. 4. c. 11.

imposed on in matters of faith by these bishops, whom he calls orthodox; for they were still heretical, and did not heartily agree to the Nicene faith, so that his infallibility was deceived: and though St. Ambrose calls Liberius "of happy memory," where he cites a sermon of his; that is a phrase which the primitive charity used of some men not altogether orthodox:* but it is a great prejudice to Liberius's repentance, that though Athanasius speaks of him as having been once his friend, and reports his apostasy, yet he never mentions his turning catholic again. Wherefore we conclude, that all these fictions and falsifying of evidence, and slight conjectures in Baronius and the notes, are intended only to blind the reader, and hinder his finding out an heretical Pope, whose fall is clear, his continuance in his heresy very probable, and his repentance (if it be true) came too late to save his Church's infallibility, though it might be soon enough to save his own soul.

The editors style the Council at Ariminum,† "a General Council," and yet dare not say, as usually, *under* Liberius, who had no hand in it, for it was called by the Emperor Constantius, as all writers agree;‡ so that it seems there may be a General approved Council (as they style this§) which the Pope doth not call. Moreover, the Emperor in his first epistle orders the bishops to send him their decrees, that he might confirm them;|| and though Baronius saith this was done like an heretical emperor, yet the orthodox bishops observed his order, and call it, "obeying the command of God, and his pious edict:"¶ wherefore this General Council was both called and confirmed by the Emperor. Again, Constantius in his epistle declares, "it was unreasonable to determine any thing in a Western Council against the Eastern bishops." Whence it appears he knew nothing of the Western patriarchs claiming an universal supremacy over all the churches both of the East and West; and for this reason Baronius leaves this genuine epistle (recorded in St. Hilary's fragments) out of his Annals. We have also noted before, that though the orthodox bishops in this Council (who must know the matter) say, "that Constantine was baptized after the Council at Nice, and soon after his baptism

* Vid. Baron. Annal. An. 362 p. 58, et An. 371. p. 246.

† A.D. 359.

‡ Sulpic. Sever. Histor. lib. 2.

§ Lab. p. 792. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 482. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 794. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 482. col. 2.

¶ Baron. An. 359. §. 6, et 15. [Ibid. p. 629, 632.]

translated to his deserved rest," as the ancient historians read that passage, and the sense of the place shews they could mean it of none but Constantine;* yet Baronius corrupts the text, and reads Constans instead of Constantine, only to support the fable of Constantine's being baptized by Sylvester at Rome; and the editors follow him in that gross corruption; for they examine nothing which serves the interest of Rome. As for the Arian Synods this year at Seleucia and Constantinople, I need make no remarks on them, because the Pope is not named in them, and so there is no occasion for them to feign anything. Only one forgery of Baronius must not be passed over; that when Cyril of Jerusalem was deposed by an Arian Synod, he is said to have appealed to greater judges, and yet he never named the Pope; the reason of which (Baronius saith) "was, because the true Pope Liberius was then in banishment;"† but hath he not often asserted Felix was a Catholic, and if Cyril had thought fit, might he not have appealed to him? But it is plain by Socrates, that Cyril meant to appeal to the Emperor and his delegates, as all injured bishops in that age had used to do.

§. 25. Upon the restitution of Athanasius from his third exile after the death of George the Arian bishop,‡ he called a Council of bishops at Alexandria, for deciding some differences among the Catholics, about the manner of explaining the Trinity, and to agree on what terms recanting Arians were to be received into the Church. And though neither Athanasius, nor any ancient historian, take any notice of the Pope in this eminent action, yet the editors out of Baronius say, "it was called by the advice and authority of Liberius;"§ and to make out the notorious fiction of this Pope's calling this orthodox Council (even while he was an Arian) the notes affirm, Eusebius, bishop of Vercelles, and Lucifer Calaritanus, as the Pope's legates, were present at it; which they take out of Baronius, who had before told us, that Lucifer Calaritanus was at that time at Antioch, and sent two deacons to Alexandria to subscribe for him; yea, this Synod writes their synodical letter to Eusebius, Lucifer, and other bishops, which plainly shews they were absent; though it seems by Rufinus, that Eusebius came afterwards, and subscribed to what had been

* Theod. lib. 2. cap. 19. Sozom. lib. 4. cap. 17. collat. cum Baron. An. 350. §. 7.

† Baron. An. 359. § 65.

‡ A.D. 362.

§ Lab. p. 809. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 487. col. 1. Baron. An. 362. p. 73.

agreed in the Council, and was by the authority of this Council (not of the Pope) sent into the East to procure peace among those churches: nor have they any one authority to prove either he or Lucifer were the Pope's legates, nor any reason, but because they were employed in great actions, though in that age (it is plain) the Popes were little concerned in any eminent business. Moreover, they bring in a fragment of an epistle writ (according to the ancient custom) by Liberius, at his entrance into the See of Rome, to shew his faith to Athanasius, as if it were written now merely to impose on the reader a false notion of his being at this time orthodox and concerned in this Synod. They also cite another epistle of Athanasius, to certify Liberius what was done here; but that epistle is nowhere extant in Athanasius's works, but is cited out of the acts of the second Nicene Council, where there are more forgeries than genuine tracts quoted; and besides, the epistle is directed not to the Pope, but to one Ruffinianus, and only mentions the Roman Church's approving what was done here; but the epistle being suspicious, it is no goodevidence; and we conclude with Nazianzen, "that Athanasius in this Synod gave laws to the whole world:"* and Pope Liberius had no hand in it.

About this time there were divers Councils called in France by St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, and the Catholic faith was settled in them; one of which was held in Paris, and the synodical epistle is extant;† yet the Pope is never named in it: nor in that orthodox Synod at Alexandria, wherein Athanasius and his suffragan bishops presented a confession of their faith to Jovian, then newly made Emperor;‡ which shews, that Liberius either was an heretic at this time, or else that he was very inconsiderable: so that it is a strange arrogance in the editors to say, that the second Council at Antioch was under Liberius;§ when the very notes say, it was called together by Meletius, and observe, that many Arian bishops did there recant their heresy; a thing, which a little before they pretended could be done nowhere but at Rome, in the Pope's presence.

Upon Valentinian's advancement to the empire,|| the Eastern bishops petition him to call a Council, and he (being then very busy) told them, they might call it where they pleased; which

* Baron. An. 362. tom. 4. p. 66.

† Lab. p. 821. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 490. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 823. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 490. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 826. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 491. col. 1.

|| A.D. 365.

the editors pretend was a declining to meddle in church affairs, being a layman; but the bishops' petition, and his giving them liberty, shews, that the right of calling Councils was in him; and so was also the confirming them, as appears from the bishops sending the acts of this Council (at Lampsacus) to the Emperor Valens to be confirmed.* The same bishops also sent their legates with letters to the Western bishops, and particularly to Liberius, bishop of Rome, hoping Valentinian the other Emperor had been in that city; but he being absent, these legates persuaded Liberius they were orthodox; upon which he writ back letters in his own name, and in the name of the other Western bishops, to own them for good Catholics.† Whence we may note, first, That the Eastern bishops' letter styles the Pope no more but colleague and brother. Secondly, That Liberius calls himself only Bishop of Italy, *Liberius Ep. Italiae, et alii occidentis Episcopi*: but Baronius alters the pointing, *Liberius Episcopus, Italiae et alii, etc.*, by that trick hoping to conceal this mean title.‡ Thirdly, The Pope here saith, "he was the least of all bishops, and was glad their opinion agreed with his and the rest of the Western bishops." Fourthly, Yet after all, these very Eastern bishops were of the Macedonian party, as the title of their letter in Socrates shews.§ Baronius indeed leaves these words out of the title; but he confesses they were semi-Arians: so that the Pope's infallibility (as being imposed on by heretics in matters of faith) loses more by this embassy than his supremacy gains by it, because the legates were not sent to him alone, but to all the Western bishops. Fifthly, The notes on this Council feign,|| that besides these communicatory letters, Liberius writ other letters, commanding that ejected bishops should be restored by the apostolic authority: but this is one of Baronius's forgeries;¶ for St. Basil, and also Sozomen, cited by the notes on the Council of Tyana,** mention not the legates shewing any other letters at their return into the East, but only the communicatory letters; and since it appeared by them that the Western bishops judged them orthodox, their Eastern brethren did restore them: and so also these legates got the approbation of a Council in Sicily, as they were returning home; for the Sicilian bishops by mis-

* Sozom. lib. 6 cap. 7.

† Socrat. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 11.

‡ Ep. 11, Liberii ap. Bin. p. 472. Baron. An. 365. p. 153.

§ Socrat. ut supr.

|| Lab. p. 830. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 492.

col. 1.

¶ Baron. An. 365, p. 154.

** Lab. p. 836. Bin. p. 494. col. 1.

take took them for orthodox, when they saw the rest of the Western bishops owned their communion with them, and so approved their confession of faith; and therefore it is very impertinent in the notes to say on this occasion,* "that the authority of the Pope was so great, that if he admitted even suspected heretics to his communion, none presumed to reject them." Whereas we know, that afterwards the people of Rome rejected even the Pope himself for communicating with semi-Arians.

The next thing which occurs is a Synod in Illyricum, convened at the request of Eusebius, bishop of Sebastia, one of the Eastern legates, who (while his fellows staid at Rome) went into that country, and prevailed with the bishops assembled there to send Elpidius, a brother and colleague of their own, with a synodical letter to the Eastern bishops, declaring they would communicate with them, if their faith was the same with that of Nice. Now, though this Synod do not mention the Pope, yet Baronius and the notes feign, that Elpidius was the Pope's legate;† whereas the Synod, the Emperor's letter, and Theodoret (from whom this story is taken) mention Elpidius only as a messenger sent from this Council.

When these Eastern legates returned home, there was a Council called at Tyana in Cappadocia,‡ wherein they shewed the communicatory letters which they had fraudulently obtained in the West; upon which letters, those who had been ejected as heretics, and particularly Eustathius of Sebastia, were restored to their sees; but neither Sozomen nor St. Basil say this was done by any special letters of Liberius, or by any command of his; yet if it had been so, this would spoil this Pope's infallibility, it being certain these restored bishops were heretics, whom Liberius, poor man! thought to be good Catholics; and he hath the more to answer for, if this were done not by his consent alone, but by his command also.

After this we have the life of Pope Felix, about whom they differ so much, that nothing is plain in his story but this, that little of him is certainly known. The Pontifical in Liberius's life saith, he died in peace; but here it saith, "he was martyred by Constantius, for declaring him a heretic, and one who was rebaptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia:" yet Constantius was not baptized at all till after Felix's pretended martyrdom, and

* Concil. Siciliæ, Lab. et Bin. ut supra.

† Lab. p. 832. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 493. Baron. An. 365. p. 155.

‡ Lab. p. 836. Bin. p. 494. col. 1.

he was baptized then (not by Eusebius, but) by one Euzoius. Again, the Pontifical allows him but to sit one year and three months, and the notes say, this is right, computing from Liberius's fall to his return; which (as Sozomen affirms) was but little before Felix's death :* whereas these very notes tell us, a little before, that Liberius was above two years in exile;† therefore, if he lived but a small time after Liberius's return, he must sit above two years: but Marcellinus (who writ in that age) tells us, Felix lived eight years after Liberius was restored: which Baronius and the notes would conceal, to hide the scandal that their Church must get by a long schism, and by a heretical Pope, of whom they will needs make a martyr, only upon the credit of the Pontifical, and a modern fallacious inscription, pretended to be found at Rome many ages after, belonging to some Felix, but which of them they know not.

The epistles ascribed to this Pope contain so many and so gross untruths, that Labbé notes, they are discarded by Baronius and other learned men, as Isidore's wares;‡ adding that the third epistle was stolen from Pope Martin I.-in his Lateran Council.§ And though Binius often cites the two first epistles, yet in his notes on them, he owns they are of no credit: || for they forge many canons as made at Nice, and tell that idle story of the true copies of the Nicene canons being burnt by the Arians.¶ But it is certain the forger of these epistles was a creature of the Pope's, because the inscriptions of them are stuffed with false and flattering titles, and the body of them nauseously and ridiculously press the supremacy, and the universal empire of the Roman Church.

§. 26. The entrance of Damasus** into the Papacy was not without blood, for the people were divided, and some standing for Damasus, others for Ursicinus, Damasus's party being stronger, slew many of their adversaries in a church, as all the writers of that age testify;†† and though Ammianus be a Pagan historian, yet it is very probable which he writes, that it was not zeal, but the ambition of living high and great, that made men contend so fiercely for the Papacy; for St. Basil himself, about this time, taxes the Roman Church with pride;

* Lab. p. 843. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 490. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 742. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 466. col. 1.

‡ Lab. marg. p. 844, et 849. § Id. marg. p. 856.

|| Lab. p. 849. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 499. col. 1.

¶ Richer. Hist. Concl. lib. 1. c. 1. §. 9. [Colon. 1683.] ** A. D. 367.

†† Am. Marcel. lib. 17. Ruffin. lib. 2. c. 10. Hieron. in Chron.

and St. Jerome, the great friend of that church, often reflects upon the pomp and luxury of the clergy there: so that the notes on Damasus's life do but glory in their Church's shame, when from these authors they boast of the magnificence and majesty of the Papacy.* The fabulous Pontifical was for many ages pretended to be writ by this Damasus; and he who forged the Decretal Epistles invented one to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage;† wherein Damasus is feigned to send him (at his request) all the epistles written by the Popes, from St. Peter to his time; and this of old was the preface to the Decretal Epistles: but the forgery is so gross that Binius rejects it; and if his affection for the Papacy had not biassed him he would also have rejected all the epistles, which are as arrant forgeries as this preface. The first and second epistles, written in Damasus's name to Paulinus and the Eastern bishops, are suspicious. The third epistle of Damasus to Jerome, is evidently forged by some illiterate monk; but St. Jerome's answer seems to be genuine; yet the notes reject it ‡ for no other reason, but because it truly supposes the Pope and his clergy were so ignorant as to need St. Jerome's help to make them understand the Psalms, and affirms, that Rome obeyed his directions in singing the Psalms, and adding the *Gloria Patri* to them; whereas whoever considers the learning and authority of St. Jerome in that age, will not think it at all improbable that he should teach the Roman bishop. And Binius is forced to cite this epistle wrong in his notes, to get a seeming argument against it; for the epistle doth not advise them to sing the *Gloria Patri* after the manner of the East (as he quotes it) but to sing it, to shew their consent to the Nicene faith. The fourth epistle of Damasus to Stephen, archbishop of the Council of Mauritania, with Stephen's epistle to him, are owned by Labbé to be both spurious.§ But since they magnify the Pope's supremacy Binius justifies them both, for whose confutation let it be noted, first, That it is absurd to style a man archbishop of a Council. Secondly, That in this epistle is quoted a forged epistle of Felix, owned by Binius himself to be spurious.|| Thirdly, That place of

* Lab. p. 860. [vol. 2. Lut Par 1671.] Bin p. 503. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 862. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 503. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 868. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 506. col. 1.

§ Lab. marg. p. 869. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 506, &c.

|| Bin. p. 499.

Matthew xvi. is falsely quoted here, and thus read, "Thou art Peter, and upon thy foundation will I set the pillars (that is, the bishops) of the Church." Fourthly, The latter of them is dated with Flavius and Stilico, who were not consuls till Damasus had been in his grave full twenty years, as Labbé confesses; wherefore we justly discard these gross forgeries devised of old, and defended now only to support the Pope's usurped power. The fifth epistle says, "the institution of the *chorepiscopi* was very wicked and extremely evil;" yet presently after it owns, "they were appointed in imitation of the seventy disciples, and were at first necessary for the primitive Church:" it is also dated with Libius and Theodosius, who were never consuls in Damasus's time; and finally, Labbé owns that much is stolen out of the epistles of later Popes;* yet Binus will not reject it, because it hath some kind touches for the supremacy. The sixth epistle to the bishops of Illyrium passes muster also with him, though it be dated with Siricius and Ardaburus, who were not consuls till thirty years after Damasus was dead.† The seventh epistle is dated with the same consuls, yet Binus allows of it, because in it the Pope pretends to give laws, not only to Italy but to all the world; though Labbé confesseth the cheat, and owns it was stolen by Isidore out of Leo's forty-seventh epistle.‡ So unfortunate is their supremacy, that whatever seems to give any countenance to it, always proves to be forged. The decrees attributed to this Pope seem to have been the invention of later ages; for it is not probable Damasus would have fathered a lie upon the Nicene Council in saying, "it was decreed there that laymen should not meddle with oblations;"§ or that he would say, "such as broke the canons were guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost:" nor doth his decree against the pall agree to this age. So that Damasus's name hath for better credit been clapped to these decrees by the modern compilers, who are the guides to our editors.

About this time the Arians,|| having the Emperor Valens on their side, began to grow bold; but Athanasius condemned them in Egypt by divers synods, and upon his admouition Damasus held two synods at Rome; in the first of which Ur-

* Lab. p. 876. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 509. col. 1.

† Lab. p. 882. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 511. col. 1.

‡ Lab. p. 883. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 511. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 885. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 512. col. 1.

|| A. D. 369.

sacius and Valens, two Arian bishops, were condemned, and in the latter, Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, was deposed; not by the Pope's single authority, as the notes and Baronius vainly pretend,* but by the common suffrage of ninety bishops assembled with him, as the words of Athanasius and the very Council's letter plainly shew. And though Baronius here talks of the Pope's sole privilege in deposing bishops, there are innumerable instances of bishops deposed without the Pope's leave or knowledge; and Auxentius valued and believed Damasus's authority so little, that notwithstanding this sentence of the Pope in Council, he kept his bishopric till his death.

Apollinaris † having disseminated his heresy at Antioch, complaint was made to Damasus of one Vitalis, who held those errors; but the Pope (who had not the gift of discerning the spirits) was imposed on by his subscribing a plausible confession of faith, so that he wrote on his behalf to Paulinus bishop of Antioch.‡ It is true, at the request of St. Basil, Damasus did this year join with Peter, bishop of Alexandria (who was then at Rome), in condemning Apollinaris in a Roman Council;§ but Nazianzen saith, "he did not this till he was better instructed in the points:" for at first (as the notes confess) this Pope took Apollinaris for a pious and learned man, and so held communion with him, till he understood by St. Basil's third epistle that he was a heretic. I know they excuse this by saying that St. Basil himself, and Nazianzen, and St. Jerome, were all at first under the same mistake with Damasus: but then none of these ever were pretended to be infallible judges in matters of faith, as Baronius holds Damasus was; so that the mistake in them is pardonable; but upon Baronius's principles I see not how Damasus's infallibility can be secured, when he was so long deceived by a heretic, and was forced to be instructed by a private bishop at last, even in cases of heresy.

The next year a Council was held at Valentia in Dauphiné; the true title of which saith, it was under Gratian and Valentinian (the emperors); but the editors put a new title over it, and say it was under Damasus,|| who is not once named in it; the French bishops there assembled making canons for their

* Bin. p. 512, et 513. Baron. An. 369. p. 190, &c.

† A. D. 373.

‡ Baron. An. 373. p. 301.

§ Lab. p. 895. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 514. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 904. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 516. col. 1.

own churches, without asking the Pope's leave, or desiring his confirmation.

Upon the death of Valens, the Arian emperor,* while Valentinian was yet very young, Gratian managed both the Eastern and Western empire; and he makes a law to suppress all heresies, and to take away the use of churches from all such as were not in communion with Damasus, bishop of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria.† Theodoret indeed (who, as Baronius owns, is much mistaken in his relating this matter‡) names only Damasus in his report of this law; and Baronius cites the law out of him, merely to make it seem as if Damasus were the sole standard of catholic communion, though the original law still extant,§ and all other historians, name Peter of Alexandria as equal with Damasus. Perhaps the reader may wonder there is no other patriarch named in this law; but it must be observed, that Antioch at this time had two orthodox bishops, who separated from each other, Meletius and Paulinus; to make up which unhappy schism, there was a synod this year held at Antioch under Damasus,|| say the editors; but in truth under the Emperor's legate, who was sent to see a peace concluded between these two bishops by the advice of the Council there assembled: and Damasus had so little interest in this Council, that Meletius was generally approved for the true bishop, and Paulinus (whose party the Pope favoured) ordered only to come in after Meletius's death:¶ so that since this Council acted contrary to the mind of Damasus, it is very improper to say, it was held under him.

§. 27. The second General Council at Constantinople** was called by the Emperor Theodosius, whom Gratian had taken for his partner in the empire, and assigned him for his share the Eastern provinces; where this pious prince finding great differences in religion, he convened this Council to confirm the Nicene faith, to settle ecclesiastical matters, and to determine the affairs of the see of Constantinople. This Council the

* A.D. 378.

† Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 4. [p. 282. Cantab. 1720.] Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 2. [p. 264. Cantab. 1720.]

‡ Theod. lib. 5. cap. 2. [p. 194. Cantab. 1720.] et Baron. An. 378. p. 339. [ut supra, vol. 5. p. 459, 460.]

§ Cod. Justin. lib. 1. tit. 1. de sum. Trin. Ll. 1.

|| Lab. p. 908. Bin. p. 517. col. 1.

¶ Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 5. [ut supra, p. 266.] Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 3. [ut supra, p. 281.] Theod. lib. 5. cap. 3. [ut supra.]

** A.D. 381.

editors introduce with a preface or general history, and conclude it with partial and false notes, hoping to persuade the world, that it was both called and confirmed by the Pope: for which end we read in the preface, "that Theodosius made a law for all to follow the faith which the Apostle Peter delivered to the Romans, and which Pope Damasus preached :"* which shews as if the Pope was the sole preserver of the faith; whereas the law itself truly cited runs thus: "Which Pope Damasus, and Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolical sanctity, are known to follow."† And in another law of the same Emperor's next year, those are declared to be catholics, and capable of benefices, who were in communion with the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Laodicea, Tarsus and Iconium,‡ and in that law neither Damasus nor Rome are mentioned; which shews it was not the peculiar privilege of any see, for its bishop to be made the standard of catholic communion, but the known orthodox opinion of that bishop who sat in this or that eminent church. The rest of the forgeries in this Council will best appear by considering, first, by whom this Council was called. Secondly, by whom it was confirmed. Thirdly, what authority hath been ascribed to it: and, fourthly, whether the canons and creed ascribed to it be authentic.

First, As to the calling this Council, Baronius had twice guessed, but never proved that Damasus moved Theodosius to call it:§ this the preface improves, and saith, "It was called by the Emperor, not without Damasus's authority;" and the title before the notes advances it still—"gathered (say they) by the authority of Pope Damasus, and the favour of Theodosius."|| But when this is to be proved, their evidence is, pretended monuments in the Vatican, that shop of forgeries; the testimony of later Popes in their own cause, and some very remote conjectures and fraudulent inferences. Yet at last they affirm, "that none but a pertinacious heretic will affirm, that this pious Emperor, who was most observant of the sacred canons, would call this Synod."¶ By which bold censure, they condemn not only all the ancient historians, but all the Fathers here assembled for pertinacious heretics: for the Council's

* Lab. p. 915. Bin. p. 521.

† Cod. Justin. ut supra, et Baron. An. 380. p. 358.

‡ Baron. An. 381. p. 384.

§ Baron. An. 380. p. 359, et 362.

|| Bin. p. 540.

¶ Lab. p. 968. Bin. p. 542. col. 1.

letter to Theodosius saith, "We were called together by your epistle;"* and when they were to have met at Rome, they affirm, "That Damasus summoned them to meet there, by the Emperor's letter."† Socrates also and Sozomen expressly say, "The Emperor called this synod at Constantinople."‡ Theodoret also doth affirm the same,§ though the notes strive to pervert his words: but Richerius, a learned Romanist,|| hath fully cleared this point, and shewed that Theodosius called this General Council by his sole authority. And the acts of the sixth General Council, with Photius (cited falsely in these notes) do only import, that the Pope gave a subsequent consent to it, which is no proof that he was concerned in calling it.

Secondly, As to the confirming it, the preface and the notes confidently aver, "That they sent their acts to Damasus to be approved, and he did confirm them;"¶ yet they tell us, that Pope Gregory above 200 years after declared, "That the Church of Rome as yet neither had, nor received the acts of this Council." I know they would shuffle off this contradiction, by pretending that Damasus confirmed only the matters of faith, not the canons. But first, Gregory denies their having the acts of this Council, and the acts contain matters of faith as well as canons. Secondly, They cannot shew any proof that Damasus made any distinction: if he confirmed anything, it was all; for if subsequent consent be confirmation, then he consented to all, and confirmed all that was done here. But in our sense of giving an authentic character to this Council's decrees, Theodosius alone confirmed them; for the bishops desire him, "by his pious edict, to confirm the decrees of this synod."** And they writ not to Damasus till the year after the Synod, and their letter was directed not to him alone, but to Ambrose and other Western bishops with him;†† nor do they in it desire any confirmation from him or any of them, but say, "that they and all others ought to approve of their faith, and rejoice with them for all the good things which they

* Lab. p. 946. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 533.

† Ep. ad Damasum ap. Bin. p. 539.

‡ Socrat. hb. 5. cap. 8. [ut supra, p. 268, 269.] Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 7. [ut supra, p. 285.]

§ Theod. lib. 5. cap. 7 [ut supra, p. 200.]

|| Richer Hist. Concil. hb. 1. cap. 5. §. 1, et 2. [Colon. 1683]

¶ Lab. p. 917, et 967 [ut supra.] Bin. p. 521, et 541.

** Lab. p. 946 [ut supra.] Bin. p. 533.

†† Theodor. hb. 3. [hb. 5.] cap. 9. [ut supra, p. 203.]

have done;" with which letter probably they sent (as was usual) a transcript of all their acts: and Photius saith, "That Damasus, bishop of Rome, afterwards agreed with these bishops, and confirmed what they had done;"* that is, by consenting to it, which is no more than every absent bishop may do, who in a large sense may be said to confirm a Council, when he agrees to the acts of it after they are brought to him.

Thirdly, The authority of this Council is undoubted, having been ever called and accounted the second General Council, and so it is reckoned in all places where the General Councils are mentioned; which title it had not, as Bellarmine vainly suggests, "Because at the time when this was assembled in the East, the Western bishops met at Rome;" for that obscure synod is not taken notice of, while this is everywhere celebrated, as held at Constantinople, and consisting of one hundred and fifty bishops, which were they who met in the East.† As for Damasus, Baronius cannot prove he was concerned in it, but by "we think, and we may believe;"‡ yet he elsewhere boldly says, "Damasus gave it supreme authority;"§ and the annotator makes it impossible "for any Council to be general, unless the Pope or his legates be there." Now he and all others call this a General Council; and yet he saith, "That neither Pope Damasus, nor his legates, were presidents of it, nor was he or any Western bishop in it." Whence we learn, that there may be a General Council, at which the Pope is not present by himself nor by his legates, and of which neither he nor they are presidents.

Fourthly, As to the creed and canons here made, the modern Romanists, without any proof, suppose that Damasus allowed the former, and not the latter: but if he allowed the famous Creed here made, I ask, whether it then had these words "and from the Son," or no? If it had, why do the notes say, "That these words were added to it by the bishops of Spain and the authority of Pope Leo long after?"|| But if these words were wanting, as they seem to confess (when they say, "the Roman Church long used this Creed without this addition") then I must desire to know, how a man of their Church can be secure of his faith, if what was (as they say) confirmed by Damasus in a General Council, may be altered by a few bishops and

* Photius de 7 Synod. cap. 2.

† Lab. p. 967. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 541. col. 2.

‡ Baron. An. 380. p. 359. et An. 381. p. 368.

§ Idem. p. 382.

|| Lab. p. 972. Bin. p. 543. col. 2.

another Pope, without any General Council? As to the canons, Damasus made no objection against them in his time; and it is very certain that the Bishop of Constantinople, after this Council, always had the second place. For as the first General Council at Nice gave old Rome the first place, as being the imperial city; so this second General Council doubted not, but when Constantinople was become new Rome, and an imperial city also, they had power to give it the second place, and suitable privileges. Yea, the notes confess, that St. Chrysostom, by virtue of this canon, placed and displaced divers bishops in Asia; and the fourth General Council at Chalcedon (without regarding the dissent of the Pope's legates) allowed the Bishop of Constantinople the second place, and made his privileges equal to those of old Rome;* which precedence and power that Bishop long retained, notwithstanding the endeavours of the envious Popes: and Gregory never objected against these canons, till he began to fear the growing greatness of the patriarch of Constantinople; but when that Church and empire was sinking, and there appeared no danger on that side to the Popes, then Innocent III. is said by the notes, "to revive and allow this canon again:" by which we see, that nothing but interest governs that Church, and guides her bishops in allowing or discarding any Council: for now again, when the Reformed begin to urge this canon, Baronius and the notes say, "They can prove by firm reasons that this canon was forged by the Greeks;" but their reasons are very frivolous. They say Anatolius "did not quote this canon against Pope Leo" I reply, it is very probable he did, because Leo saith, "He pleaded the consent of many bishops;" that is (if Leo would have spoken out) "in this General Council." Secondly, They urge that this canon is not mentioned in the letter writ to Damasus. I answer, that they have told us before, they sent their acts to him, and so need not repeat them in this letter. Thirdly, They talk of the injury done to Timotheus, bishop of Alexandria; but his subscription is put to the canons as well as the Creed, and it doth not appear that ever he or any of his successors contended for precedence after this with the Patriarch of Constantinople: and that the modern Greeks did not forge this canon is plain, because Socrates and Sozomen both mention it;† and the catholic Church always

* Vid. Concil. Chalced. Can. 28. et Subscrip. ibid.

† Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 2. [ut supra, p. 264.] Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 8. [ut supra, p. 287.]

owned it for authentic. Yea, in the Council of Chalcedon it is declared, that the Bishop of Constantinople ought to have had the second place in the factious synod at Ephesus, and he is reckoned in that fourth General Council next after the Pope, whose legates were there, and yet durst not deny him the second place, in which he sat and subscribed in that order, having first had this canon confirmed at Chalcedon : so that all churches but that of Rome submit to this General Council ; and they who pretend most to venerate them, do despise and reject the authority of General Councils, if they oppose the ends of their pride and avarice. To conclude, here is a General Council called and confirmed only by the Emperor, assembled without the Pope or his legates, decreeing matters of faith and of discipline, yet everywhere owned and received as genuine, except at Rome (where interest made them partial), and still no less valued for that by all other churches ; which gives a severe blow to the modern pretences of their Papal supremacy and infallibility.

The same year there was a Council at Aquileia in Italy, wherein divers Arians were fully heard and fairly condemned. Now this Council was called by the Emperor, the presidents of it being Valerian, bishop of Aquileia, and Ambrose, bishop of Milan ; but Damasus is not named in it, nor was he present at it in person, or by his legates, though this Council was called in Italy itself, and designed to settle a point of faith : but these bishops (as the acts shew) did not judge heretics by the Pope's authority, but by Scripture and by solid arguments : and they tell us, "it was then a custom for the Eastern bishops to hold their Councils in the east, and the Western theirs in the west ;"* which argues, they knew of no universal monarchy, vested in the Pope, and giving him power over all the bishops, both of the East and West. For it was not Damasus, but the prefect of Italy, who writ about this Synod to the bishops of the East ;† nor did this Council write to the Pope, but to the Emperor, to confirm their sentence against heretics ; wherefore Damasus had a limited authority in those days, not reaching so much as over all Italy, and extended only to the suburbicarian regions, out of which, as being Damasus's peculiar province, Ursicinus, his antagonist for the Papacy, was banished by the Emperor Valentinian ;‡ and therefore Sulpicius Severus calls him not *Orbis* but *Urbis Episcopus*,§ the bishop of the city, not of the

* Lab. p. 980. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 545. col. 2.

† Baron. An. 381. p. 386.

‡ Baron. An. 371. p. 235.

§ Sulpic. Sever. p. 423.

world ; and speaking of Italy, he saith in the next page, “that the supreme authority at that time was in Damasus and St. Ambrose.”* To these two therefore the Priscillian heretics applied themselves, when they were condemned by the Council of Caesar-Augusta or Saragosa in Spain, in which country the sect first began ; but when they could not get these great bishops to favour their cause, they corrupted the Emperor’s ministers to procure a rescript for their restitution.† Now it is strange that this Council of Saragosa should bear the title of “*under Damasus*,” and that the notes should affirm, Sulpicius Severus plainly writes thus : for if we read Sulpicius as above cited, we shall find that Damasus knew nothing of this Synod till long after it was risen ; so we may conclude this invention of theirs is only to support their pretended supremacy.

§. 28. From a passage in St. Jerome,‡ and the inscription of the letter writ from the Council of Constantinople, the editors gather, “that Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, and Ambrose, with other of the Western bishops, met at Rome in Council this year, which they call the fourth Roman Council under Damasus ;”§ who probably did preside in this Synod, as all bishops use to do in their own cities ; but he did not call this Council, for St. Jerome expressly saith, “the Emperor’s letter called these bishops to Rome.”|| And the synodical letter of the Constantinopolitan Fathers tells us, “that Damasus desired Theodosius to write to them also of the East, to come to Rome” Which shews that Damasus could not summon them by his own authority ; but the editors and Baronius, out of a false Latin version of Theodoret, have put in the word “*Mandato*,” which word is not in the Greek, nor anything answering to it ;¶ and it was foisted in on purpose to persuade such as did not read the original, that the Pope had commanded the Eastern bishops to come to Rome. Again, though the notes confess the acts of this Roman Council are lost, so that it doth not appear what was done there ; yet soon after they produce a long canon for the Pope’s supremacy, and the precedence of the patriarchs, feigning it was made in this Synod. But if the canon be not a Vatican forgery (which is very much to be suspected), how-

* Id. p. 424.

† Lab. p. 1011. Bin. p. 554. col. 1.

‡ A.D. 362.

§ Lab. p. 1014. Bm. p. 554. col. 2.

|| Hieron. Ep. 27.

¶ Theodor. lib. 5. cap. 9. [ut supra.] Baron. An. 382 p. 397. et Bin. p. 539. col. 2.

ever it is antedated one hundred and twelve years, as Labbé confesses in his margin; for he saith, it was decreed under Pope Gelasius, A.D. 494.* But the policy of laying this canon here, is to make a show as if Damasus had then publicly declared against the Council of Constantinople's giving that bishop the second place; but their forging this proof, only shews they have no genuine authority for it; yet if they could prove that the Pope disliked this precedence, since it is certain that Constantinople did take the second place according to this canon, that would only shew, that the Pope's authority was not regarded. Which also appears in the case of Flavianus, who (as the notes conjecture) was in this Roman Synod deposed, and Paulinus made bishop of Antioch: yet still the greatest part of the world owned Flavianus for the true bishop of that see, and the Synod of Sides, where Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium, was president, directed their synodical epistles to Flavianus, as patriarch of Antioch,† so that the editors should not have styled that Council, "under Damasus," because they acted against his mind: and so did the Eastern bishops, who met again this year at Constantinople, when the Pope had desired them to come to Rome; and from this meeting they writ that synodical epistle which the editors here print over again, and wherein they call Jerusalem, "the mother of all Churches;" a title now by usurpation appropriated only to Rome.

§. 29. Siricius succeeded Damasus,‡ but not without trouble: for Ursicinus, the competitor of Damasus, being yet alive and at Rome, was declared Pope by a great party, and Prosper's Chronicle makes him the next Pope after Damasus;§ nor could Siricius get the chair, but by a rescript from the Emperor Valentinian, which condemned Ursicinus, and established Siricius.|| There is little or no notice of him before his election, and though he sat fifteen years (as the Pontifical and Platina), or thirteen (as the notes say), there is very little worthy remarking done by him: and it is very probable he was one of those ignorant clergymen with which the Roman Church was so well stored at that time, that St. Jerome saith, "not one of them did so much as pretend to scholarship: but this illiterate faction, who had proclaimed war against all learning, conspired

* Lab. p. 1014. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 554. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 1015. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 556. col. 2. Baron. An. 383.

‡ A.D. 385.

§ Baron. An. 384. p. 327.

|| Baron. An. 385. p. 335.

also against him.”* For we have reason to judge this Pope to be of their party, because St. Jerome left Rome in disgust as soon as Siricius came to be Pope; and Paulinus, who came in his time to Rome, saith, “the city Pope proudly despised him;”† yea, Baronius owns, “that Ruffinus, when he was fallen into Origen’s heresy, imposed on the simplicity of this Pope, and got communicatory letters of him;”‡ which also seems to spoil his infallibility, for which ignorance is no proper qualification. Yet wanting real matter in this Pope’s life, the notes run out into the story of the death of Monica, St. Augustine’s mother, saying, “that when she died, she was only solicitous to have the mass offered up for her;”§ and this they prove out of Augustine’s Confessions: but the Father’s words are, “she only desired to be commemorated in the offices when the priest stood at the altar.” Now there is a mighty difference between that ancient custom of commemorating the faithful departed, which is allowed by the Church of England, and the Popish way of offering mass for the souls of the deceased, a corruption of much later date than St. Augustine’s time.

For this Pope are published divers decretal epistles, which are the first that can pretend to be genuine; and if they be really so, it is plain that their style is mean, the arguments trifling, and the Scripture proofs impertinent; so that the author was no conjuror. The first directed to Himerius is very severe against marriage, especially in the clergy: the notes would persuade us, “It is not lawful marriage which he calls pollution,” (as they say Calvin falsely affirms;||) but if we read the epistle, he calls new marriages (that is, the marriage of such as had been widows) pollution, as well as those marriages which were prohibited. Again, he foolishly attempts to prove clergymen ought not to marry, because St. Paul saith, “those that are in the flesh cannot please God:” and though he confess it was usual for many clergymen to live with their wives, he calls that cohabitation, the being polluted with carnal concupiscence, in his fourth epistle: so that he is justly taxed with speaking profanely of God’s holy ordinance, and of contradicting St. Paul, who excepted not the clergy, when he said,

* Hieron. in Præf. ad Didym. de Spir. Sancto.

† Paulin. ad Sever. Epist. 1.

‡ Baron. An. 397. p. 32. ex Hieron. ep. 16.

§ Lab. p. 1016. [ut supra.] Bm. p. 557. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 1022. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 559. col. 2.

"marriage is honourable in all men, and the bed undefiled," Heb. xiii. 4. And probably it was the hot and bold discourses of Siricius and some other writers of his time, which provoked Jovinian not only to stand up for marriage, but to decry single life, the merit of which had so possessed the minds of some great men, that they resolved to condemn Jovinian for an heretic. As for the second epistle of Siricius to the Council of Milan, relating to this resolve, it may be questioned whether it be genuine; but that the style is harsh and barbarous is unquestionable. The answer to this letter from Milan is evidently patched up out of divers authors who writ upon this subject; however, St. Ambrose and his suffragans there call the Pope brother, even when they compliment him, "as a great master and doctor;"* which smells strong of the forge, and if this epistle were made up there, then the notes need not triumph so much, when it says (upon Jovinian's being condemned at Rome), "that the Bishop of Rome had looked well to the gate committed to him;" that is (say they), "the gate of the whole Church, of which Christ made St. Peter's successors the door-keepers."† But if the epistle be true, it only commends the Pope for looking well to the gate of his own church at Rome, as they had done to their gate at Milan, having turned him out of that church before. The third epistle of Siricius is like the former for style and sense; yet the editors will not reject it, because the Pope saith, "he hath the care of all the churches;"‡ but let it be noted, that Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, uses the same words of himself a little after,§ and there Binius notes, that Aurelius means of the churches of Africa only, not of the whole world: so we may say justly of Siricius here, that he means, "he had the care of the suburbicarian churches, not those of the whole world." For the fourth epistle (said to be writ from a Roman Council) calls the Pope no more but a primate,|| and that title belonged to the bishop of Carthage, as well as to him of Rome; but indeed Labbé honestly confesses this fourth epistle to be stolen out of Innocent's epistle to Victorius. The fifth and sixth epistles are writ by Maximus, an usurper of the empire, and seem to be genuine; but we need not wonder at the tyrant's speaking so kind things of the Pope in them, since it was his interest to flatter the bishop of that potent city.

* Lab. p. 1024. [ut supra] Bin. p. 560, et 561.

† Lab. p. 1027. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 561. col. 1 Baion. An. 390 p. 536.

‡ Lab. p. 1027. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 561. col. 2.

§ Bin. p. 577. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 1029. Bin p. 562. col. 1.

§. 30. This Maximus having seized on the north-west parts of the empire, summoned a Council at Bordeaux (which the editors without any ground style, *under* Siricius), wherein the bishops of the Gallican Church again condemned the Præscillianists, and they appealed (not to the Pope, but) to the Emperor Maximus;* who was so far from advancing these heretics, that at the instance of Ithacius, a Catholic bishop, he caused them to be put to death for their heresy. Which cruel sentence so displeased Theognistus and other orthodox bishops, that they excommunicated Ithacius and all his party, who had procured these heretics to be put to death; and St. Martin, St. Ambrose, and the best men of that age, would not communicate with any of these bishops, who had persecuted men to death for heresy: no not though Ithacius and his adherents were absolved from Theognistus's excommunication in a Council which Maximus had called at Triers. Now the notes, fearing the reader should observe, that many Popes and bishops of their communion have done just as Ithacius did, *viz.* persecuted such as they call heretics to death, and delivered them up to the secular magistrate to be executed, tell us, "that it was not an ill thing in Ithacius to procure the death of these heretics, but his fault was in the violence of his proceedings, and in his not interposing such a protestation as their Church uses on these occasions. Wherein, when they have made it necessary for the magistrate to put an heretic to death, they solemnly declare, they wish he would amend, and do not desire his execution."† But as this protestation is a piece of notorious hypocrisy unknown to those ages, so we may be sure so apparent a sham would not have excused Ithacius, whose communion (as Sulpicius Severus shews) was renounced by St. Ambrose, St. Martin, and others, purely because they thought it unlawful, especially for clergymen, to procure any persons to be put to death for their opinion, though it were heresy. Wherefore these holy bishops, if they were now alive, must renounce the communion of the Roman Church for the same reason for which they renounced the communion of Ithacius, even for their frequent procuring heretics to be put to death; and this is so plain, that all their shuffling notes cannot wash their bishops' hands from blood, nor fit them, in St. Ambrose and St. Martin's opinion, to celebrate the eucharist with other Christians.

* Lab. p. 1030. [ut supra] Bm. p. 563. col. 2.

† Lab. p. 1038. [ut supra.] Bm. p. 564. col. 1. Baron. An. 386. p. 451

There had been (as we noted) a long schism at Antioch,* between Paulinus (of whose side was the Pope and many western bishops) and Flavianus, who was supported by the eastern bishops; and now Paulinus dying, one Evagrius was irregularly chosen to succeed him, and keep up the schism; and though Flavianus was owned for the true bishop by the second General Council, and he it was who ordained St. Chrysostom, and obtained a pardon from Theodosius for those citizens of Antioch who had broke down the statues of that Emperor and his Empress; yet at the instance of some western bishops, the Emperor was persuaded to cite him to a Council which he had called at Capua, in which St. Ambrose was present; but Flavianus, not willing to have his enemies to be his judges, did easily excuse his non-appearance to the Emperor, and the Synod thereupon referred the matter between him and Evagrius, unto Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, to whose decision Flavianus refusing to stand, he appealed to Theodosius; on which occasion St. Ambrose, writing to Theophilus, wishes rather Flavianus had referred the matter "to his brother, the bishop of Rome, because (saith he) you would probably have judged it (if it had come before you) so as he would have liked."† Which implies no more than that Theophilus and Siricius were both of one mind in this case of Flavianus; yet on this slight occasion the notes say, "that the Synod made Theophilus arbitrator, on condition he should offer his sentence to be approved and confirmed by the Roman Church:"‡ which is a mere forgery; for Theophilus was made absolute arbitrator by the Synod; and this is not the Council's wish, but St. Ambrose's; and after all, Flavianus did not think a western Synod had any power over him; and therefore he rejected the arbitration of Theophilus, the Council, and Pope Siricius also, with whom, though he did not communicate, yet he was always owned to be true Bishop of Antioch.

§. 31. The second Council at Arles is supposed to be held about this time, because the followers of Photinus and Bonosus were there condemned: wherefore they say, "it was in the time of Siricius;" but under him it could not be, since the bishops there assembled do not name him, nor do they except the Bishop of Rome's supreme power, when they refer all ecclesiastical matters to the final decision of their own metro-

* An. Dom. 398.

† Ambros. ad Theophil. ep. 78.

‡ Lab. p. 1039. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 564. col. 1.

politian and his Synod, and declare, that every bishop who receives a person excommunicated by another, shall be guilty of schism. Yet the editors are so apt to dote upon the Pope's managing all Councils, that they here style a meeting of the Novatian heretics at Angaris, in Bithynia,* "a Synod under Siricius;" and call poor Socrates a Novatian, for barely relating a matter of fact concerning the Novatians.

At this time there was a great Council at Hippo,† which the notes sometimes call a General, and sometimes a Plenary Council, because most of the African bishops were there, and the original dates it with the consuls of this year; but the editors clap a new title to it, saying, it was *under* Siricius, who in all probability had no hand in it, nor knew any thing of it: yet here were made many of those famous canons for discipline, by which the African Church was governed. But they are more wary in the next Council of Constantinople, at which many bishops were present, and among them the two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, being summoned (in the absence of the Emperor) by his prefect Ruffinus; and they will not venture to say, this was under Siricius, for the matters treated on it wholly related to the Eastern Church, and in that age they rarely allowed the Pope to concern himself in their affairs: no, nor in Africa neither, where (A.D. 395) there were Councils held both by the orthodox and the Donatists, which are dated by the consuls, and no notice is taken of the Pope.‡ We shall only observe, that upon one of these Councils the notes say, "It is a mark of the Donatists being of the synagogue of Antichrist, that they named the several parties among them from the leaders and founders of their several sects, and were not content with the name of Christians from Christ." Which note reflects upon the monks of their own Church, who are called Benedictines, Dominicans, and Franciscans, from the founders of their several orders.

In the Council of Turin,§ composed of the Gallican bishops, they decided the case of primacy between the Bishops of Arles and Vienna, without advising with the Pope, and determined they would not communicate with Felix, a bishop of Ithacius's party, according to the letters of Ambrose, of blessed memory, Bishop of Milan, and of the Bishop of Rome. Now here the Roman advocates are much disturbed to find St.

* Lab. p. 1041. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 566. col. 2.

† A.D. 393.

‡ Lab. p. 1153. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 567. col. 2.

§ A.D. 397.

Ambrose's name before Siricius; and when they repeat this passage in the notes, they falsely set the Pope's name first, contrary to the express words of the fifth canon, and impudently pretend, "that the Bishop of Rome, by his place, was the ordinary judge who should be communicated with, and Ambrose was only made so by the Pope's delegation."* But how absurd is it (if this were so) for the Council to place the name of the delegate, before his who gave him power? And every one may see, that this Council was directed to mark this decree principally by St. Ambrose's advice, and secondarily by the Pope's; for at that time Ambrose's fame and interest was greater than that of Siricius: yet after all, the Council decreed this, not by the authority of either of these bishops (as the notes pretend), but only by their information, and upon their advice by these letters, which were not first read (as they pretend), but after four other businesses were dispatched.

The canons of divers African† Councils, held at Carthage and elsewhere, have been put together long since, and collected into one code, which makes the time and order of the Councils wherein they were made, somewhat difficult; but since the canons were always held authentic, we need not (with the editors) be much concerned for their exact order, or for reducing them to the years of the Pope, because they were neither called nor ratified by his authority. Yea, the notes say, "It was never heard that any but the Bishop of Carthage called a Council there, his letters gave summons to it, he presided over it, and first gave his suffrage in it,"—and that "even when Faustinus (an Italian bishop), the Pope's legate, was present."‡ As for the particular canons of the third Council, the nineteenth saith, "that the readers shall either profess continence, or they shall be compelled to marry:" but they feign old copies which say, "they shall not be allowed to read, if they will not contain;"§ the falsehood of which appears by the twenty-fifth canon in the Greek and Latin edition, where this is said of the clergy, ἐκτὸς τῶν ἀναγινωσκῶν; that is, "except the readers," which they translate, *quamvis lectorum*,|| on purpose to make us think, that the command of celibacy (upon which that age too much doted) reached the

* Lab. p. 1157, et 1158. Bin. p. 568, et 569.

† A.D. 397, &c.

‡ Lab. p. 1163. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 573. col. 1, et 2.

§ Lab. p. 1170. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 575. col. 1.

|| Bin. p. 580.

lowest order of the clergy, even readers, contrary to the express words of the canon, and to the second Council of Carthage, where only bishops, priests and deacons, are under an obligation to live single.* Secondly, the twenty-sixth canon of the third Council forbids the bishop of the first see to be called by the title of Prince or Chief of bishops; (Gratian goes on) "neither may the Roman bishop be called Universal."† The notes tax Gratian indeed for adding this sentence; but if he did, it was out of Pope Gregory, who saith, "that no patriarch ought to be called Universal." Besides, considering how apt the editors are to strike out words not agreeable to the interest of Rome, it is more probable that some of the Pope's friends lately left these words out, than that Gratian put them in: and since this Council "forbids appeals to foreign judicatures with peculiar respect to Rome," to which some of the criminal clergy then began to appeal,‡ it is not unlikely these Fathers might resolve to check as well the title, as the jurisdiction (then beginning to be set up) which encouraged these appeals. Thirdly, the 47th canon in the Latin, and the 24th in the Greek and Latin edition, speaking of such books as are so far canonical that they may be read in churches, reckons up some of those books which we call Apocryphal; upon which the notes triumph.§ But let it be observed, that we grant some of these books to be so far canonical, that they may be read for instruction of manners; and also we may note, that the best editions of these African canons leave out all the Books of Maccabees and Baruch, which are foisted into their later Latin copies.|| And it is plain, the whole canon is falsely placed in this Council under Siricius, because Pope Boniface (who came not into the Papacy till above twenty years after) is named in it as Bishop of Rome; yet after all these devices, it doth not declare what books are strictly canonical, and so will not justify the decree at Trent. Fourthly, in the 48th canon of the Latin version, the Council agrees to advise about the Donatists, with Siricius, bishop of Rome, and Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, not giving any more deference to one of these bishops than to the other, but looking on them as equally fit

* Bin. p. 571.

† Lab. p. 1170. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 575. col. 2. and Gratian Decret. part 1. dist. 99.

‡ Lab. p. 1171. [ut supra.] Bm. p. 581. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 1177. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 580. col. 1.

|| Cosen's History of the Canon, p. 112, et 113.

to advise them : yet the notes boldly say, " They advise with the Pope, because they knew he presided as a bishop and doctor over the catholic Church ; but with the Bishop of Milan only, as a man everywhere famous for his learning."* Which is a mere fiction of their own, for the words of the canon shew, that these Fathers did not believe either of them had any authority over them, only they desired their advice jointly, as being both eminent and neighbouring bishops, and their prohibiting appeals shew, they knew nothing of the Pope's presiding over the catholic Church.

§. 32. Anastasius was the last Pope in this century,† of whom there would have been as little notice taken as of many of his predecessors, if it had not been his good fortune to be known both to St. Jerome and St. Augustine, and to assist the latter in suppressing the Donatists, and the former in condemning the errors of Origen, for which cause these two Fathers make an honourable mention of him. Yet in the African Councils, where he is named with respect, they join Venerius bishop of Milan with him, and call them " their brethren and fellow-bishops."‡ As for the qualifications of Anastasius, St. Jerome gives him great encomiums ; but it must be observed, that at this time Jerome had charged Ruffinus with broaching the heresies of Origen at Rome ; and he being then at Bethlehem could not beat down these opinions without the Pope's help. And indeed, when Ruffinus came first to Rome, he was received kindly by the last Pope Siricius ; and Anastasius did not perceive any errors in Ruffinus or Origen, till St. Jerome (upon Pammachius's information) had opened his eyes ; and at last, it was three years before this Pope could be made so sensible of this heresy as to condemn it : so that notwithstanding his infallibility, if St. Jerome and his friends had not discovered these errors, they might in a little time have been declared for orthodox truths at Rome : but Anastasius condemning them at last, did wonderfully oblige St. Jerome ; and this was the occasion of many of his commendations. For this Pope are published three decretal epistles, though Baronius mentions but two, and condemns the first for a forgery ; and so doth Labbé.§ It is directed to the bishops of Germany and Burgundy, and yet Burgundy did not receive the Christian faith till the year 413 ; it is also dated with the consuls of the

* Lab. p. 1183. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 584. col. 2. † A.D. 398.

‡ Baron. An. 401. p. 128, et 129.

§ Lab. p. 1191. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 585. col. 2. Baron. An. 402. p. 161.

year 385, that is, fourteen years before Anastasius was Pope. The matter of it is grounded on the Pontifical, which speaks of a decree made by this Pope for the priests at Rome to stand up at the Gospel; which the forger of this epistle turns into a general law, and makes it be prescribed to the Germans. The words of it are stolen out of the epistles of Pope Gregory and Leo:* yet out of this forgery they cite that passage for the supremacy, where the German bishops are advised to send to him as the head. The second epistle† is also spurious, being dated fifteen or sixteen years after Anastasius's death, and stolen out of Leo's 59th epistle. As for the third epistle, it is certain he did write to John, bishop of Jerusalem, but it may be doubted whether this be the epistle or no;‡ if it be genuine, it argues the Pope was no good orator, because it was written in mean Latin; yet that ~~was~~ the only language he understood, for he declares in this epistle, "that he knew not who Origen was, nor what opinions he held, till his works were translated into Latin." So that any heretic, who had written in Greek in this Pope's time, had been safe enough from the censure of this infallible judge.

The notes dispute about the fourth Council of Carthage, whether it were under Pope Zosimus or Anastasius;§ but it was under neither, the true title of it shewing it was dated by the consuls' names, and called by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, who made many excellent canons here without any assistance from the Pope. The 51st, 52nd, and 53rd canons of this Council order monks to get their living, not by begging, but by honest labour; and the notes shew this was the primitive use;|| which condemns those vast numbers of idle monks and mendicant friars now allowed in the Church of Rome. The 100th canon absolutely "forbids a woman to presume to baptize;" but the notes¶ (because this practice is permitted in their Church) add to this canon these words, "unless in case of necessity, and except when no priest is present." Which shews how little reverence they have for ancient canons, since they add to them, or diminish them, as they please, to make them agree with their modern corruptions.

* Gregor. lib. 12. Ep. 32. Leon. Ep. 2. ad Episc. Ital.

† Lab. p. 1193. [vol. 2. Lut. Par. 1671.] Bin. p. 586. col. 2.

‡ Lab. p. 1194. Bin. p. 586. col. 2.

§ Lab. p. 1208. Bin. p. 591. col. 1.

|| Lab. p. 1210. Bin. p. 592. col. 1.

¶ Lab. p. 1211. Bin. ut supra.

In the fifth Council of Carthage, can. 3, bishops and priests are forbid to accompany with their wives *κατὰ τοὺς ἰδίους ὅρους*, that is, "at the time of their being to officiate;" but in their Latin copies it is altered thus — "according to their own (or, to their former) statutes;" which makes it a general and total prohibition: but the Greek words of this canon are cited and expounded at the great Council in Trullo, where many African bishops were present, as importing only a prohibition of accompanying with their wives, when their turns came to minister;* which is the true sense of this canon, though the Romanists, for their Church's credit, would impose another. The fourteenth canon of this Council takes notice of the feigned relics of martyrs, and of altars built in fields and highways, upon pretended dreams and revelations; upon which canon there is no note at all,† because they know, if all the feigned relics were to be thrown away, and all the altars built upon dreams and false revelations pulled down in the present Roman Church (as was ordered at Carthage by this canon), there would be very few left to carry on their gainful trade, which hath thrived wonderfully by these impostures.

This century concludes with a Council at Alexandria, which they style *under* Anastasius;‡ but it was called by Theophilus, who found out and condemned the errors of Origen long before poor Anastasius knew anything of the matter. The notes indeed say, "this Synod sent their decrees to Pope Anastasius, to Epiphanius, Chrysostom and Jerome." But though they place the Pope foremost, there is no proof that they were sent to him at all. Baronius only conjectures they did, and saith, "it is fit we should believe this;"§ but it is certain Theophilus sent these decrees to Epiphanius, to Chrysostom and Jerome; and from this last hand it is like Anastasius received them long after, because it was more than two years after this Synod before St. Jerome could persuade Anastasius to condemn these opinions of Origen, which this Council first censured. Wherefore it was happy for the Church, that there were wiser men in it than he who is pretended to be the supreme and sole judge of heresy. And thus we have finished our remarks upon the Councils in the first four centuries; in all which the reader

* Lab. p. 1219. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 594. col. 2. Beveridg. Concil. tom. 2. p. 130.

† Lab. p. 1217. [ut supra.] Bin. p. 594. col. 1.

‡ Bin. p. 595.

§ Baron, An. 399. p. 85, et 88.

(I hope) hath seen such designs to advance the supremacy, and cover the corruptions of Rome, that he will scarce credit anything they say for their advantage in any of the succeeding volumes.

AN APPENDIX CONCERNING BARONIUS'S ANNALS.

§. 1. The large and elaborate volumes of Cardinal Baronius are the main guide to the editors and annotator. From him they take the dates of all Councils, and out of him they have added divers new Synods not extant in the older editions of the Councils; of which they can say no more than to abbreviate Baronius. From him they borrow most of their plausible notes, by which they either paint over that which seems for the interest of Rome, or disprove what makes against it; and therefore we have had often occasion to discover his fallacies in all that part of his Annals which concerns the Councils; but there are many other notorious frauds and manifest falsehoods in that author, of which I shall here give some few instances, which may serve as a caution to all that read his history, and also as a direction by which they may in other centuries find out his manifold errors; and I shall confine the examples here produced to the fourth century, because that is the most largely treated of in this discourse.

It is evident that all the writers of the Roman side, for many ages, have designed to impose upon the world; in that their disputants, their publishers of Councils, and historians do all agree; for their principles and practices cannot be maintained by plain truth. The methods used by Baronius, in his Ecclesiastical Annals (which he writ purely to serve the interest of the Roman Church) may be reduced to these heads:—

First, His frequent quoting forged and spurious tracts; such as the Pontifical, the Acts of the Martyrs, the Ecclesiastical Tables (that is, the Roman Missal and Martyrology), with other late and fabulous writers, such as Nicephorus, Simeon Metaphrastes, Laurentius Surius, &c. And the reader shall find he very seldom cites any other authors to prove the great actions of primitive Popes, or the dignity of the Roman Church and its pretended privileges: as also to make out the miracles done by many of their saints, and to be evidence for the invocation of saints, praying for the dead, worshipping the cross, relics, and images; for the merits of celibacy, and holiness of monks, or other superstitions. Some examples of which in the fourth century are these: he cites the acts of Procopius,

which he confesseth need amending, to prove the adoration of the cross:* he proves the same by the acts of Gregory, an Armenian bishop, which he owns do not satisfy many; and by Euthymius, a late Grecian monk, A.D. 1180.† Thus he asserts Crispus's being baptized with his father Constantine only by Nicephorus; and makes out Constantine's use of putting an image of Christ on his coins only by the acts of Damasus, and by a coin which he himself confesseth had been adulterated.‡ Constantine's baptism in Rome is also proved by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who there hath the false character of an accurate writer;§ and by the acts of Sylvester, which he himself disapproves of in many things,|| and suspects, that notwithstanding all these fabulous authors, his reader will not credit the story.¶ The legend of St. Agnes and her temple at Rome, he confesses, was made by an unknown hand under the name of St. Ambrose; yet he gives a long relation of it.** So when Eusebius, who writ accurately about the temple built over the sepulchre by Constantine, saith nothing of pictures in it, he proves there were such there by the second Nicene Council.†† Eusebius's Greek Chronicle saith nothing of the invention of the cross, but some forger hath put it into the Latin version of it; therefore Baronius cites the corrupted Latin translation to prove this legend.‡‡ The miracles of St. Nicholas are all transcribed out of his acts, which were put together by authors who lived about five hundred years after his time, and the genuine ancient historians mention not one of them.§§ Eusebius saith, Constantine dedicated his new city of Constantinople to God; but Baronius chooses to follow a later writer of little credit, *viz.* Nicephorus; who saith (in the phrase of his own time), he dedicated it to the Virgin Mary.|||| He makes a discourse about the use of the pall in the life of Pope Mark; yet he can cite no author, but the fabulous Pontifical, to prove it was used in his time.¶¶ To prove the Arian Pope Felix was a martyr, he cites an inscription pretended to be found in a grave

* Baron. An. 308. p. 30. §. 19. [p. 453. vol. 3. Lucæ, 1738.]

† Id. An. 311. p. 57. §. 23. [p. 485. ut supra.]

‡ Id. An. 324. p. 233. §. 13, et 16. [p. 34. vol. 4.]

§ Ibid. p. 237. §. 30. [p. 39. vol. 4.] || Ibid. §. 31. [p. 40. ut supra.]

¶ Ibid. p. 238. §. 32. [p. 40. ut supra.]

** Ibid. p. 260. §. 107. [p. 64. ut supra.]

†† Baron. An. 326. p. 353. §. 42. [p. 175. vol. 4. ut supra.]

‡‡ Id. ibid. §. 46. An. 326. p. 366. §. 86. [p. 189. vol. 4. ut supra.]

§§ Ibid. An. 330. p. 396. §. 4. [p. 225. vol. 4. ut supra.]

¶¶ An. 336. p. 458. §. 63. [p. 291. vol. 4. sect. 64. ut supra.]

at Rome (where such frauds are common), about 1200 years after his death;* so he makes out the martyrdom of divers under Julian, by an oration of Nectarius (which he confesses is corrupted), and by Nicephorus:† and a little after he tells long stories of martyrs at that time condemned by Julian at Rome; which he proves by the Ecclesiastical Tables, and by the Acts of the Martyrs; yet he owns Julian was not at Rome at this time.‡ Prayers at the graves of the saints he would establish by a forged book of the lives of the Prophets, which he cites under Epiphanius's name.§ So he would make out prayers for the dead, used in this age, by feigned writings, which are ascribed to Ephræm Syrus.|| The miracles ascribed to Damasus cannot be proved by one author of credit, but are set off with the forged acts of Damasus and the modern legends.¶ So also the miracles ascribed to St. Chrysostom are not taken generally from any approved authors, but from his spurious acts;** and (to name no more) thus he proves the adoration of the cross by a homily falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom:†† for his genuine works do witness against this practice. And now that he did not cite these authorities out of ignorance is plain from his confession; for he saith of the Acts of the Martyrs, "that we might better have wanted many truths concerning them than have had such a mixture of errors, as makes the whole suspected."‡‡ And again, speaking of the acts of Gallicanus, "it is the manner of some to be ashamed to give a short narrative of a great affair, and so according to their own fancy they largely paraphrase on it:"§§ and yet again, in his preface to the Roman Martyrology, he tells us, "there was a sad loss of these martyrs' acts in Diocletian's time, so that very few of them are to be found which may not in part be convicted of mistakes."||| But Melch. Canus is more ingenuous, and saith, "Diogenes Laertius writ the lives of the philosophers more honestly than the Christians have writ those of the saints:"¶¶ yet you rarely

* An. 357. p. 715. §. 50. [p. 612. sect. 58. Lucæ, 1738.]

† Annal. tom. 4. An. 362. p. 21, et 22. [p. 56. vol. 5. sect. 41.]

‡ Eod. An. p. 84. [p. 69.]

§ An. 373. p. 309. [An. 372. p. 394. sect. 110. ut supra.]

|| An. 378. p. 332. [p. 448.] ¶ An. 384. p. 427. [p. 573. ut supra.]

** An. 386. p. 468. [p. 614. sect. 60. ut supra.]

†† An. 397. tom. 5. p. 44.

‡‡ Baron. An. 307. §. 33. p. 24. tom. 3. [p. 445. vol. 3. ut supra.]

§§ Id. An. 330. §. 51. p. 410. [p. 239. vol. 4. Lucæ, 1738.]

||| Bar. Præcap. ad Martyr. c. 3.

¶¶ Melch. Can. loc. Theol. l. 11. p. 333.

have any better evidence than these for most of the Roman doctrines and rites. And though Nicephorus and the modern Greeks be frequently taxed by him for giving easy faith to feigned stories, and for gross mistakes;* yet when they tell never such improbable tales for the Roman interest, then they are cited with great applause. Now it is a clear evidence of an ill cause, when they can find no other proofs but such spurious writings as these: of which practice I have here given but a few instances; but the diligent reader will observe this to be customary with Baronius, not only in this fourth century, but in every part of his Annals.

§. 2. Another artifice is, to corrupt the words or the sense of genuine authors, of which we will select also a few instances in the same century. St. Augustine barely names Peter as one whom the Pagans did calumniate;† but Baronius brings this in with this preface, “that they did this because they saw Peter extremely magnified, especially at Rome, where he had fixed his seat;” and then he saith, “St. Augustine records this,” &c. whereas this is his own invention to set off the glory of Rome.‡ So when Athanasius is proving that the Fathers before the Nicene Council used the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and first names Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, and then Dionysius, bishop of Rome,§ Baronius saith, “he proves it especially by Dionysius the holy Roman Pope, and by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria,”|| inverting the order, and putting a note of eminence on the Pope, contrary to the words and sense of Athanasius. Again, he cites Pope Leo (who is no evidence in his own cause); and yet Baronius would make him say more than he doth, even where he saith more than he should say: for he cites his 53rd epistle to shew that Leo affirmed the sixth canon of Nice allowed to the church of Alexandria the second, and to that of Antioch the third seat, “which had before been conferred on them by Rome.” But the very words of Leo, cited by Baronius, shew this to be false; for Leo saith not that these sees had their dignity or order from Rome, but the former from St. Mark, the latter from Peter’s first preaching there.¶ Moreover, to make his reader fancy the Roman and

* An. 306. §. 12. p. 3. et tom. 4. An. 363. p. 105. [p. 415. vol. 3. Lucæ, 1738.]

† Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. 18. c. 53. [p. 864. vol. 7. Paris, 1838.]

‡ Baron. An. 313. §. 17. [p. 541. ut supra.]

§ Athanas. de Decret. in Arian.

|| Baron. An. 325. §. 69 [p. 110. sect. 68. vol. 4. ut supra.]

¶ Leon. ep. 53. ap. Baron. An. 325. §. 28. [p. 59. ut supra.]

the catholic Church was all one of old, he mentions, out of Epiphanius, Constantine's writing an epistle to all Romania: "which name (saith he) we sometimes find used for the catholic Church;"* whereas it is manifest that Epiphanius both there and elsewhere plainly uses Romania for the Roman empire;† and Baronius did not find it used either in him, or in any other ancient author, in any other sense. That period in Optatus, which Baronius cites with great applause (if it be not added by some ignorant zealot of the Roman side), is a scandal to the learning of that Father; for he derives the Syriac word *Cephas* from the Greek *Κεφαλή*, and by that ridiculous etymology would draw as contemptible a consequence, viz. that Peter was head of the Apostles: and again he seems wilfully to pervert the precept of St. Paul, Rom. xii. 13, "Distributing to the necessities of the saints;" which in Optatus's reading is, "communicating with the memories of the saints;" that is (as he applies it) "with Rome, where there are the memorials of two of the Apostles." I could wish, for Optatus's credit, that these weak passages were spurious, or buried in silence; and the learned Baldwin is ashamed of this gross error:‡ but Baronius thinks, though they make for the dishonour of the Father, they tend to the credit of Rome; and so he cites them in great pomp, and puts them in a whole line to make them look more plausible, — "the head of the Apostles, whence he was called Cephas" (so Optatus; but Binius adds) "deducing the interpretation from the Greek word, for in Syriac it signifies [*durissimam*, the hardest] a hard stone;"§ and then glories extremely, as if Optatus had made communion with Rome, the sole note of a catholic. Whereas in the next page but one, Optatus goes on, "you cannot prove you have any communion with the seven churches of Asia; and yet if you be out of the communion of those churches, you are to be accounted aliens." Which passage Baronius very fraudulently leaves out,|| because it shews a true catholic must not only be in communion with Rome, but also with all other orthodox churches.

To proceed, even in spurious authors he useth this artifice; for that forged book of Constantine's munificence only saith "he placed a piece of the cross in a church which he had built:" but Baronius relates it, "that he placed it there with most religious

* Baron. An. 319. §. 6 [p. 3. vol. 4. Lucæ, 1738.]

† Epiphan. contra Manich. hæ. 66, et contr. Arian. hæ. 69.

‡ Opt. Milev. lib. 2. p. 48. Baldwin. notis, p. 184.

§ Baron. An. 321. §. 5. [p. 21. ut supra.] || Opt. Milev. lib. 2 p. 50.

worship [*cultu religiosissimo*]:"* and a little after, he perceiving that fabulous author had supposed Constantine buried his mother long before she died, puts in of his own head, "but this (*i. e.* the putting his mother in a porphyry coffin) was done afterwards."† Speaking of the bishops returning home from the Council of Nice, he saith, "they took with them the rule of faith, confirmed by the Pope of Rome, to be communicated to their people and to absent bishops." But no historian, ancient or authentic, mentions any preceding confirmation of the Nicene Creed by the Pope, who was one of the absent bishops, to whom it was to be communicated; wherefore those words of its being confirmed by the Pope, are invented and added to the story by Baronius.‡ He observes that Constantine confesses he was not fit to judge in the case of Athanasius, because ecclesiastical matters were to be judged among the clergy: which he proves by Constantine's letter there recited; but Constantine's letter is not directed to the clergy, but "to the people of the catholic church at Alexandria:" and his words are to the people who lived on the place, and knew the matters of fact; and therefore he saith to them, "it is proper for you, and not for me, to judge of that affair;"§ so that Baronius forceth his own sense upon the Emperor. And when Theodoret speaketh of "time for repentance according to the canons of the Church," he adds, "that is, for satisfaction." Which Popish satisfaction he would also prove out of a canon at Antioch, which only mentions confessing the fault, and bringing forth fruits meet for repentance.|| When Socrates only saith, "Eusebius of Nicomedia's letters were received by Julius after his death;" Baronius thus enlarges it, "Eusebius, who had fled from the judgment of the Roman Church, was forced against his will, being dead (as Socrates saith), to come to the strict tribunal of God."¶ Whereas Athanasius saith, "I went up to Rome, that I might visit the church and the bishop:" Baronius ridiculously infers, that when we find the ancients speaking of "THE Church and THE Bishop, they mean the Roman Church and that Bishop, of whom, and in whom, and by whom, are all other bishops."** Which note is forced upon this place, for here Rome is named in the same sentence

* Baron. An. 324. §. 105. [p. 64. vol. 4. Lucæ, 1738.]

† Id. ib. §. 114. [sect. 115. p. 68. ut supra.] ‡ Baron. An. 325. §. 197.

§ Baron. An. 329. §. 7, 8. || An. 341. §. 43. et 44. [p. 380. ut supra.]

¶ Vid. Socrat. lib. 2. c. 13. [ut supra, p. 90.] Baron. An. 342. §. 43. [p. 399. ut supra.]

** An. 349. §. 6. [p. 472. ut supra.]

with the church and the bishop, and so it must be understood of the Pope; but without any advantage to him more than it would have been to the Bishop of Eugubium to say, "I went to Eugubium and visited the church and the bishop." Again, St. Jerome saith expressly, "that Acacius substituted Felix, an Arian, to be bishop of Rome in Liberius's stead." Here Baronius pretends some copies leave out the word *Arian*, and so he reads it, "substituted *Felix* to be bishop of Rome;"* and because some such parasites of Rome as himself, who would not endure that ungrateful truth of a Pope's being an heretic, had left out this word, he boldly asserts it for the true reading; whereas not only Socrates expressly saith, "he was an Arian in opinion;" but Jerome himself, in his Chronicle, affirms, that Felix was put in by the Arians; and it is not likely they would have put him in if he had not been of their party. The Greek of Sozomen is no more but Τὸν Πέτρον θρόνον μὴ ἀδοξεῖν. But Baronius improves this by a flattering paraphrase in these words, "lest the seat of Peter should be bespattered with any spot of infamy."† But it is a bolder falsification of St. Chrysostom, where he saith (in one of his sermons on a day celebrated in memory of two martyrs, Juventius and Maximus), σήμερον ἡμᾶς συναγαγόντες Μάρτυρες; to pervert this by his Latin version thus, "the martyrs which we this day worship;" whereas Chrysostom only saith, "the martyrs which occasion us to meet this day."‡ Epiphanius expressly condemns those as heretics who worship the blessed Virgin, and saith, "no man may adore Mary." Baronius will not cite this place at large, but adds to it these words, "she is not to be worshipped as a god." Which falsification of the Father is designed to excuse their Church's idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary.§ The restitution of Peter, bishop of Alexandria, is by St. Jerome (whom he cites with applause) ascribed to the late repentance of the Emperor Valens, who recalled (now at last) the orthodox from banishment; and Socrates only mentions Damasus's letters, which Peter took with him, approving both his creation and the Nicene faith: yet he from hence notes "the supreme power of the Pope, by whose order the bishop of Alexandria was restored to his church, in contempt of Valens's authority; and

* An. 355. §. 51. [p. 550. sect. 58. vol. 4. Lucæ, 1738.]

† An. 357. §. 43. [p. 607. ut supra]

‡ Chrysost. tom. 5. p. 534. Baron. An. 362. p. 48.

§ Epiphani. Hæres. 79. Baron. An. 373. p. 309.

when he returned with the Pope's authority, the people placed him in his seat."* Yea, after this he pretends to cite Socrates, as if he said, "Peter was received, being restored by Damasus;"† yet Damasus did no more in all this matter than barely to testify that Peter was an orthodox bishop, and that he believed him duly elected; which is all that Socrates saith, and which, if any eminent orthodox bishops had testified, it would equally have served the bishop of Alexandria's cause. To conclude, Baronius owns Paulinus to have been a credulous man, and very unskilful in ecclesiastical history;‡ yet thinking he had not spoken enough, when he relates "that a church was adorned with pictures;" he stretches this into "adorned with sacred images."§ From all which instances we may infer, that the Cardinal would not stick at misquoting and misrepresenting his authors when it might serve the Roman interest.

§. 3. Of this kind also we may reckon his crafty suppressing such authorities, in whole or in part, as seem to cross the opinions and practices of their Church. His leaving out a passage in Optatus, wherein that Father makes the being in communion with the seven churches of Asia, a note of a true catholic, was noted before.|| And we may give many such like instances: Sozomen relates an imperial law, wherein those are declared heretics who do not hold the faith which Damasus, bishop of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria, then held;¶ but the fraudulent annalist leaves out Peter of Alexandria, and mentions only Damasus as the sole standard of catholic faith.** When St. Jerome saith, "his adversaries condemned him with Damasus and Peter," Baronius bids us observe, with what reverence the Pope's enemies treated him; for though they accused St. Jerome of heresy, yet against Damasus they durst not open their mouth;†† whereas St. Jerome protected himself by the authority of the bishop of Alexandria, as well as by that of the Pope. Again, after a crafty device to hide the evident testimony which Gregory Nyssen gives against going in pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he slightly mentions an epistle of St. Jerome,

* Socrat. lib. 4. cap. 30. [c. 37.] [ut supra, p. 259.] et Baron. An. 377. p. 325.

† Id. An. 378. p. 335. [An. 377. p. 438. vol. 5. Lucæ, 1739.]

‡ Baron. tom. 5. An. 395. p. 15. § Id. An. 394. p. 612.

|| Vid. supra. §. 2. et Baron. An. 321. §. 5.

¶ Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 4. p. 415. [ut supra, p. 282]

** Baron. An. 378. p. 339. [p. 457. vol. 5. ut supra.]

†† Baron. An. 378. p. 347.

which excellently confutes that then growing superstition, telling us, "that the court of heaven is as open from Britain as from Jerusalem." Which remarkable sentence, and all the other learned arguments of that epistle, he omits by design,* though if it had countenanced his superstition, we should have had it cited at large. In like manner afterwards, when he had another fair occasion to cite this same epistle, which doth so effectually condemn pilgrimages, he will not quote one word out of it, but barely mentions it, and runs out into the inquiry what time it was written.† I have given many more instances of these fraudulent concealments in my Discourse of Councils, and therefore shall add no more here, but only this, that whoever reads Baronius's Annals, hears no more generally than the evidence of one side, and that too enlarged, if it be never so slight, and commended,‡ if it be never so spurious; but whatever makes against the Roman Church is depreciated and perverted, or else clapped under hatches, and kept out of sight: of which we have an instance in Eusebius, who because he will not justify their forgeries about Constantine's baptism and donation (though he be the best of all the ecclesiastical historians), is never cited but with reproaches and calumnies;§ and whatever he saith against them is either concealed, or the force of it taken off, by reviling him as an Arian.

§. 4. Another artifice of our Annalist is, first, to suppose things which make for the honour of his Church, without any manner of proof, and then to take his own suppositions for grounds of argument. Thus he supposes, that Constantine gave St. Peter thanks for his victory, without any evidence from history;§ yea, against his own peculiar notion, that Constantine was then a Pagan, and durst not do any act to make him seem a Christian || Again, to colour their worship of images, he barely supposes that the Pagan Senate dedicated a golden image of Christ to Constantine.¶ He argues only from conjectures to prove the munificence of that Emperor to Rome; ** whereas, if so eminent a prince had given such great gifts to the most famous city in the world, doubtless some author

* Hieron. Ep. 13. tom. 1. p. 120. Baron. An. 386. p. 454, 455. [p. 609. ut supra.]

† Baron. An. 394. p. 613. [vol. 6. p. 151. Edit. ut supra.]

‡ Annal. 324. §. 143, 144, et 152. An. 325. §. 192, et 193. Et An. 336. §. 7, et 8. Item. An. 340. §. 40, &c.

§ Baron. An. 312. §. 58. [p. 517.] || Id. ibid. §. 62.

¶ Baron. An. 312. §. 68, 69. [p. 521. vol. 3. Edit. ut supra.]

** Baron. An. 324. §. 72. [p. 54. vol. 4. ut supra.]

would have mentioned it, and not have left the Cardinal to prove this by random guesses. Again, he supposes without any proof, that Constantine knew the supreme power over all Christians was in the Church of Rome.* He produces nothing but mere conjectures, that Osíus was the Pope's legate; yet he boldly draws rare inferences from this.† He doth but guess and take it for granted, that the Nicene Council was called by the advice of Pope Sylvester:‡ yet this is a foundation for the supremacy, and I know not what. Thus, when he hath no author to prove that Athanasius venerated the martyrs, he makes it out with, "who can doubt it?" and "it is fit to believe he did so."§ So he tells us, "he had said before that Damasus favoured Gregory Nazianzen in his being elected to be bishop of Constantinople."|| He supposes this indeed a little before:¶ but all ancient authors say, and he himself affirms, that Peter (bishop of Alexandria) did institute him into that bishopric.** He only supposes Siricius desired Theodosius to banish the Manichees from Rome; but the rescript is not directed to him, but to Albinus the prefect; and (except the fabulous Pontifical) there is no evidence that Siricius was concerned in this matter.†† Theodoret saith, "the Emperor chose Telemachus into the number of martyrs," but Baronius supposes "this was done not only by the Emperor's care, but by the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope."‡‡ To conclude, he affirms by guess, that St. Nicetus came out of Dacia into Italy, to visit the Apostles' tombs, and to consult the apostolical seat;§§ but no author makes this out. Now, how can any reader trust an historian, who, in relating things done many ages ago, takes the liberty to invent and suppose whatever will serve a present turn?

§. 5. Add to this, that he scruples not to contradict himself, and to tell manifest untruths to carry on the interest of Rome, which we shall prove by these examples. He affirms Cæcilianus (bishop of Carthage) relied upon one defence, the communion of the Apostolic See; but immediately tells us, "that he was supported by Constantine's favour."||| He cites St. Augus-

* Eod. An. §. 117.

† Eod. An. §. ult.

|| Baron. An. 380. p. 362.

** Idem. p. 355.

†† Baron. An. 395. §. 621.

||| Baron. An. 313. §. 18, 19.

† Eod. An. 127.

§ Baron. An. 342. §. 42.

¶ Ibid. p. 359.

‡‡ Baron. An. 389. p. 513.

§§ Baron. An. 397. p. 28, et 29.

tine, saying, Constantine (when Cæcilian's cause was referred to him) was a Christian emperor; yea, he cites a letter of Constantine, writ in a most Christian style, and yet he feigns that Cæcilianus delayed his appearing before this Emperor, because he thought it unfit that a bishop should be judged by a layman not yet baptized.* And again, eight years after this, he represents Constantine as a mere Pagan, who had never heard Peter or Paul, and took them for some heathen deities;† whereas he saith "he was a catechumen, and out of the Gospel had imbibed the Christian meekness eight years before."‡ He also affirms that "in the year 324, there was as yet none of the Senators believed the Christian faith."§ And yet he saith, two years before this, that one or both the consuls were Christians;|| yea, in the year 312, he reckons up many Senators who had given up their names to Christ ¶ Thus he contradicts himself by following those lying acts of Sylvester, in order to support the false story of Constantine's being baptized at Rome. Soon after, out of a fabulous author he talks very big of the low reverence which Constantine paid to the bishops at the Nicene Council;** whereas all the authentic historians say, the bishops rose up when he entered in, and paid him a great respect.†† And when he hath told many incredible legends about the nails of the cross, and seems to grant that divers false nails have been adored for the true, he excuses his abused Catholics for their mistaken worship of false relics, saying, that "their faith excuses their fault;"‡‡ so that lies may be innocently told and believed (it seems) at Rome. Again, he affirms, there were monks at Rome in the year 328, and proves this by what St. Augustine saw there at least fifty years after;§§ yea, in the year 340, he saith, "Athanasius first brought the institution of monks to Rome,"||| which is a manifest contradiction.

To proceed, I wonder with what face he could commend Athanasius for speaking charitably of the heretic Arius, after he was dead, when he reviles Eusebius after his death;¶¶ and never mentions any of the Protestant doctors deceased, but

* Baron. An. 316. §. 59, et 62 Collat. cum §. 60. [p. 68. vol. 4. Lucæ, 1739.]

† Baron. An. 324. §. 39.

‡ Id. An. 316. §. 65.

§ Baron. An. 324. §. 76.

|| Id. An. 322. §. 1.

¶ Id. An. 312. §. 75, et 76.

** Baron. An. 325. §. 16.

†† Idem. ibid. §. 52.

‡‡ Baron. An. 326. §. 51, et 54.

§§ Baron. An. 328. §. 20, et 21.

||| Id. An. 340. §. 8.

¶¶ Baron. An. 336. §. 44. Collat. cum An. 340. §. 38.

with the bitterest malice and in the most spiteful language he can invent : if charity were a virtue in Athanasius, then malice must be a vice in him. He largely relates many appeals to the Emperor in the case of Athanasius ; and yet when at last the Bishop of Rome was chosen arbitrator in this case, and this but once, he cries out, " Behold, reader, the ancient custom ! " &c. Whereas since the Emperors were Christians, it was the custom to appeal first to him, as his history abundantly proves.* He very largely commends the acts of martyrs, but by following them falls into many absurdities ; as where he tells us, that the Pagan temple of Daphne at Antioch was burnt two days after the martyrdom of Artemius : † yet a little after he brings in this Artemius arguing with Julian, about the burning of this temple. ‡ So he tells us, the body of St. John Baptist was burnt to ashes, except some bones which were carried into Egypt to Athanasius : and yet a little after St. Jerome affirms his bones remained at Sebaste, and wrought miracles there. § As little truth is there in his accusing Maximus the Emperor for presuming to judge of bishops' causes ; || whereas Maximus's letter to Siricius (which Baronius ¶ records) declares, " he would call the bishops to a council in what city they pleased, and refer it to them (who were best skilled) to determine these matters." Again, in order to justify those feigned relics of Protasius and Gervasius shewed now at Rome, he affirms, that " St Ambrose gave part of them to several bishops, and some of them were brought to Rome ; " whereas St. Ambrose himself (who knew best what was done) assures us, he " buried the bodies whole, putting every joint in his own order." ** And to name no more, he brags that idols were pulled down no where with more zeal than at Rome. †† Yet in the same page he tells us, there was then newly dedicated an altar there for sacrificing to the heathen gods : so that we see, designed falsehoods are not scrupled by him in things which seem to make for the honour of Rome or her opinions.

§. 6. We may also observe, that for the same ends he makes innumerable false inferences on purpose to pervert the truth : thus from St. Augustine's calling Melchiades " a father of Christian people " (as every bishop is), Baronius concludes that St.

* Baron. An. 340. §. 2. [p. 340. vol. 4. Lucæ, 1739.]

† Baron. An. 362. p. 37.

‡ Ibid. p. 44.

§ Baron. An. 362. p. 56.

|| Baron. An. 385. p. 441.

¶ Id. An. 387. p. 474.

** Baron. An. 387. p. 468. Collat. cum Ambros. Ep. 85.

†† Baron. An. 389, et 390. p. 526.

Augustine was for the Pope's supremacy :* so from bishops judging in causes where the people referred their differences to them, he frequently infers a right in bishops to judge in temporal matters.† In like manner from Theodoret's mentioning a canon of the Church in general, and (as this discourse shews) referring to the canon which forbids any bishop to judge a cause till both parties were present, Baronius gathers that the Pope was supreme over the Bishop of Alexandria, and that by the canons of Nice.‡ Again, that the Pope was not beholden to the Council of Nice for his supremacy which he had from Christ, he proves by Pope Nicholas's testimony, who had the impudence, in his own cause and for his own ends, to tell this story 500 years after :§ so he condemns the Arians for ejecting bishops without staying for the Bishop of Rome's sentence, which he proves was unjust by an epistle of Pope Julius, which says, "the Arians should first have written to all bishops, that so what was right might be determined by all ;"|| where Julius arrogates nothing to himself alone, as Baronius falsely pretends. And to make this single privilege of Rome the more credible, he doth frequently apply what the ancients say of all the bishops of the West, to the Pope : thus what St. Basil saith of all the western churches he applies only to Rome :¶ and when he recites two epistles of St. Basil, whose title is to the western bishops, and the whole discourse in it directed to many bishops, he feigns the name of the Pope is left out or lost ; and concludes these letters were peculiarly directed to him, and this only to support the Roman supremacy ;** and therefore he repeats over and over this matter, and affirms it was an embassy sent to the Pope.†† Thus, also, when St. Ambrose saith, "the western bishops by their judgment approved of his ordination ;" he infers that St. Ambrose implies, it was confirmed by a public decree of the Apostolic see.‡‡ And whereas Basil speaking of those western bishops in his time, who (he saith) kept the faith entirely ; Baronius infers from hence, that their successors, and especially the bishops of Rome, have never erred since.§§ Like to

* Baron. An. 313. §. 29. [p 545. vol. 3. Lucæ, 1739.]

† Baron. An. 319. §. 30. item An. 326. §. 100, &c. item An. 398. p. 61, et 62.

‡ Baron. An. 325. §. 128.

§ Id. ibid. §. 130.

|| Baron. An. 336. §. 34.

¶ Baron. An. 371. p. 239.

** Baron. An. 371. p. 238. et An. 372. p. 269, 270, 271, &c.

†† Ibid. 373, 274.

‡‡ Baron. An. 375. p. 320.

§§ Baron. An. 372. p. 276. et An. 373. p. 310. [p. 362. vol. 5. Lucæ, 1739.]

which is his inferring the usage of praying to saints from a pure rhetorical flourish of Nazianzen's, in one of his orations.* And thus when St. Jerome uses all his oratory to set off virginity, because that seems to make for the Roman celibacy, he takes him to be in good earnest, and will have all his reflections upon marriage to be solid arguments,† though St. Jerome himself calls them trifles.‡ But when he tells a sober truth about the ignorance of the Roman clergy, then the Cardinal tells us, "he speaks by way of hyperbole."§ From which instances it doth appear, that our Annalist did not, like an historian, endeavour to declare truth, but only to serve an interest and a party.

§. 7. Lastly, His partiality notoriously appears wherever the Church of Rome is any way concerned; for when anything of this kind comes in his way, he puts off the character of an historian, and turns disputant, labouring to confute the most ancient and authentic authors, if they seem to say anything against that Church. Thus we may observe what tedious digressions he makes about the primacy of Rome in his discourse on the Nicene Council, for which he twice make apologies. || Again, he runs into a long and very impertinent dispute about the worship of images, in an age when no good author mentions them as used in the Church. ¶ In like manner he makes a long excursion to disprove an authentic story of Epiphanius tearing a veil with a picture wrought in it, because such things were not fit to be in churches;** and he scarce ever meets with any of the Roman corruptions, mentioned in the most fabulous authors, but he leaves the history, and enlarges into remarks upon those passages. But if the writer be never so eminent that touches any of these sores, his business always is to baffle the evidence, of which there is scarce one year in his Annals wherein there are not some examples. On the other side he takes every slight occasion to make the most spiteful reflections on all that he counts enemies to the Roman Church. Thus he applies the Bishop of Alexandria's description of the Arians to the Reformed Churches, though it agree much better with those of his own religion.†† Again, he reviles us because we do not honour the modern idle lewd monks of their communion, as much as the ancients did those holy and devout monks, which were in the primitive times; though it be plain to all the world,

* Baron. An. 372. p. 285. [p. 379. vol. 5. Lucæ, 1739.]

† Baron. An. 382. p. 402. ‡ Baron. An. 390. p. 540.

§ Idem An. 385. p. 435. || Baron. An. 325. §. 136, et 140.

¶ Baron. An. 362. p. 18. ** Baron. An. 392. p. 568.

†† Baron. An. 318. §. 80. [p. 657. vol. 3. ut supra.]

these are like them in nothing but the name.* The like outcry he makes upon Protestants for undeceiving some of those silly nuns, who have been decoyed into unlawful vows merely for interest and secular ends; and affirms, the persuading these to marry is worse than the Arians ravishing and murdering them at Alexandria.† Thus also he compares the Reformed divines to the Eunomians, who taught, their faith alone would save them, though their lives were never so wicked; ‡ forgetting that their priests convert (as they call it) murderers at the gallows, by teaching them this very principle. And, to name no more examples, when St. Basil inveighs against those who despised the ancient customs of the Primitive Church, he spitefully applies this to the Reformed: § whereas in very truth they of Rome have left off more ancient rites and brought in more new ones than any sort of Christians in the world. By these and many more instances which might be given, even out of this one century, it is evident that the whole design of his history is to make all the doctrines and practices of Rome seem to be primitive and right, and that he cares not how unlawful the means be which he uses to gain this belief in his reader.

§. 8. Yet to conclude, we will observe, that after all his evil methods, there are many things which he could neither avoid relating nor yet excuse, which condemn the modern Roman Church. I wonder how he could commend Constantine for abolishing the stews, and the prostituting of Christian women there; and not observe, that the Pope now tolerates these abominations in Rome itself. || Again, how doth it agree with the *infallibility* of the Pope, to say, “that one Holy Spirit governs the Catholic Church, so as to make the bishops of all ages and places agree in the same opinion?” ¶ If this be so, what need one bishop alone be made infallible? And if it be as he saith, a doctrine taught by the Apostles, and consequently true, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; then the Pope, who condemns this as a heresy of the Greeks, is not infallible.** If Constantine had known of this infallibility lodged at Rome, he would have sent thither for exact copies of the Holy Scriptures, and not to Eusebius in Palestine. †† If Damasus had this infallible spirit, how came he (after he was Pope)

* Baron. An. 340. §. 10. [p. 343. vol. 4. Lucas, 1739.] item An. 363. p. 132.

† Baron. An. 326. §. 29.

‡ Baron. An. 360. §. 38.

§ Baron. An. 363. p. 131.

|| Baron. An. 314. §. 74.

¶ Id. ibid. §. 76.

** Baron. An. 325. §. 70. [p. 111. vol. 4. ut supra.]

†† Baron. An. 330. §. 23.

to need to be instructed in the meaning of Scripture by St. Jerome? * Or, if his successor Siricius had been infallible, how could the Origenists (who held such palpable heresies, that a woman discovered them to be in an error) impose upon his simplicity, and get letters testimonial from this sole judge of heresy? † How came the Council of Alexandria to send their decrees to Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and St. Chrysostom, and not first send them to Anastasius, who was infallible? And indeed Baronius cannot prove they were sent to him at all, but by saying, "it is fit to believe they were sent." ‡ Moreover, many things in this century related by these Annals, look not favourably upon the *supremacy*. Constantine calls Eusebius's election to the See of Antioch, "an advancement to the bishopric of the universal Church," § which looks as if he knew nothing of the Pope's pretences: that Marcellus of Ancyra, even when he was accused before Pope Julius, should call him his *fellow-minister*, would have been very saucy, if he had known Julius to be the supreme bishop of the world. || And if this supremacy had been owned of former ages, how came the Eastern bishops to be so angry at their being desired to come to Rome; ¶ yea, how came they to excommunicate the Pope for communicating with one whom they had judged a criminal? ** It is not concerning the Pope, but Athanasius, that Nazianzen saith, "he did again prescribe laws to the whole world." †† It seems the Pope was not the supreme caller of Synods, when St. Jerome (speaking of a Council which he thought was not authentic) asks, "what Emperor ordered it to be convened?" †‡ We cannot find in any genuine antiquity of this age, so great an encomium of Rome, as Nazianzen the elder gives of Cæsarea, *viz.*: "that from the beginning it was and now is accounted the mother of almost all churches, on which all the Christian world casts its eye, like a circle drawn from a centre." §§ A man would guess the Pope's authority reached no further than the suburbicarian regions, because Ursicinus (Damasus's competitor) was forbid by the Emperor from entering into Rome, or the suburbicarian regions. ||| St. Basil was very unmanly, if not unjust (had this supremacy been then claimed),

* Baron. An. 379. p. 353. [p. 469. sect. 63. vol. 5. Lucas, 1739.]

† Baron. An. 397. p. 32.

‡ Baron. An. 399. p. 85. cum 86.

§ Baron. An. 324. §. 152.

|| Baron. An. 341. §. 51.

¶ Baron. An. p. 341. §. 56, et 57.

** Id. An. 347. §. 64.

†† Baron. An. 362. p. 66.

†‡ Eod. An. p. 80.

§§ Baron. An. 369. p. 194. [p. 345. sect. 97. vol. 5. ut supra.]

||| Baron. An. 371. p. 235.

to send his first embassy unto Anthanasius, and tell him, that "he had the care of all the churches;" * yea, afterward, when he did send into the West, he directs his epistle to the Italian and Gallican bishops, without mentioning the Pope in particular: and truly Damasus (if he were supreme) took little care of his office, since upon so pressing occasions, he would neither answer St. Basil nor St. Jerome for a long time. And St. Jerome was somewhat bold when he reproves the ambition of Rome, and said, "he would follow no chief but Christ."† St. Ambrose also seems not to give that deference to the mother of all churches that he ought, since he often dined and made feasts on the Saturday, which was a fast at Rome;‡ and had the Pope then been supreme, why did Ambrose make a bishop at Sirmium in Illyria, so far from his own city of Milan?§ The same St. Ambrose ~~also~~ speaks of supreme bishops in Gallia.|| It is strange that Siricius, the supreme pastor, should let the Pagans set up an altar to the Goddess of Victory in the Roman capitol, and that St. Ambrose should be the only complainant in this case.¶ Finally, if the Pope then had any jurisdiction over the Western churches, why was he not consulted about ordaining St. Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople? And how came the Patriarch of Alexandria to be sent to, and to ordain him?*** These instances shew the supremacy of Rome was unknown in that age: and so was the *invocation of saints*, and *adoring of relics* also, as one might suspect by these passages, that the holy men of those ages, in their dangers and necessities, are said only to have prayed to God, not to the blessed Virgin, or to saints and angels for help: so did Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, against Arius;†† so did Parthenius against the Pagans;‡‡ so did Constantius the emperor, for recovery of his health:§§ so also did those Persian martyrs.||| Thus Euphrates, an eminent bishop, implores only the help of Christ against an illusion of the devil.¶¶ The Christians, who translated the bones of Babylas the martyr, did not pray to him, but praised God;*** and Macedonius, an holy monk, is observed only to call upon God night and day.††† Arcadius, the emperor, in an earthquake, prayed to the Lord,

* Baron. An. Eod. p. 236, 237, etc. [p. 341. vol. 5. Lucæ, 1737.]

† Baron. An. 372. p. 281, 282.

‡ Baron. An. 375. p. 321.

§ Idem. An. 380. p. 362.

|| Baron. An. 392. p. 558.

¶ Id. Eod. An. p. 560.

** Baron. An. 397. p. 44.

†† Baron. An. 336. §. 47.

‡‡ An. 337. §. 41.

§§ An. 338. §. 1.

||| An. 343. §. 16.

¶¶ An. 348. §. 9.

*** An. 362. p. 40.

††† An. 388. p. 477. [pp. 4, 5. vol. 6. Lucæ, 1740.]

the only preserver of the humble.* Porphyrius, bishop of Gaza, and his people, called only upon Christ, not upon any saints.† So that all these used the Protestant way of worship. And the Romanists must be very unsafe in their worship of saints, since Baronius confesses, one of their catalogues of saints puts in the names of two heretics as good Catholic saints.‡ So also as to the adoration of relics, the faithful in Persia did not keep the body of their martyr to worship, but buried it in a tomb.§ So St. Anthony, the primitive hermit, fearing and disliking this superstition, ordered his body to be put into a private and unknown grave, according to the custom of the catholic Church;|| and therefore Metaphrastes's sole evidence will not pass, for the legend of translating the bodies of St. Andrew and St. Luke to Constantinople.¶ It is true, this superstition was then creeping in, and some cheaters did begin to sell the bones of false martyrs (a trade used at Rome for many ages); but Theodosius's law severely punished this crime:** which ridiculous imposture, Julian the witty apostate had justly exposed some years before, as being contrary to Scripture and to the Christian law.††

To proceed, Had the altars been then used to be adorned with *images*, as they are now at Rome, the faithful would not have been so surpris'd at bringing in an image and placing it on the altar, as Optatus saith they were;‡‡ and Baronius can find no precedent for carrying images in procession to procure rain but the Pagan superstition.§§ In St. Ambrose's time the Virgin's apartment in the church was not adorned with pictures or images, but (after the Protestant way) with sentences of holy Scripture.||| Theodosius should have excepted the images of the saints, when he forbade the honouring any images void of sense, with lighting tapers, offering incense and garlands to them:¶¶ so that doubtless this is an *innovation* in their Church, and so are many other of their rites. The Pope's bull, to choose a stranger to be bishop of a church whereof he never had been a member, was unknown when Pope Julius condemned this practice.*** The custom of putting the wafer in the communicant's mouth (as Baronius confesseth), was unknown in this cen-

* An. 396. p. 21. [p. 220. sect. 7. vol. 6. Lucæ, 1740.]

† An. 398. p. 71.

‡ Baron. An. 340. §. 41. et An. 341. §. 11. § An. 343. §. 16.

|| Baron. An. 358. §. 23. ¶ Ibid. §. 25. ** Baron. An. 386. p. 455.

†† Id. An. 362. p. 92. et An. 361. p. 36.

‡‡ Baron. An. 348. §. 33 §§ Baron. An. 362. p. 60.

||| Baron. An. 377. p. 327. ¶¶ Baron. An. 392. p. 562.

*** Baron. An. 341. §. 17. [p. 357. vol. 4. ut supra.]

tury, when (Protestant like) they took it into their hands.* In St. Augustine's time the people at Rome fasted on Wednesdays, which use they have now left off.† When the rites of burial, used at Christian funerals, are described by Nazianzen (on occasion of the funeral of Cæsarius), there is no mention of any prayers for his soul, for that superstition was not then allowed.‡ The carrying a cross before them in procession, cannot be made out in this age but by the spurious acts of martyrs cited by Metaphrastes.§ But, lest I tire the reader, I will conclude with one or two instances more, to shew the difference between modern Rome and this age: their monks now are not like those of that time, but resemble the Messalian heretics, who pretended to "pray continually, and never used any labour, and claimed all men's alms as due only to them; who said, that marriages might be dissolved, seducing children from their parents, and boasting they were pure from sin; yea, wearing sackcloth that all might see it."|| Theodosius made a law to banish monks from cities, and oblige them to retire into desert places:¶ but the modern monks are all for noble seats in the best frequented cities; so that these and those are vastly different. Finally, he makes the persecuting spirit of Macedonius, and the patience of Athanasius, a mark to distinguish truth from heresy. Now, if we apply this mark, as none are greater persecutors than the Romanists, so we must conclude none are further from the truth.**

And now by these few instances, within the compass of one century, the reader may judge what truth there can be in that religion, that needs so many frauds to hide its faults; and what trust can be given to that historian, who, to serve an ill cause, makes no scruple to use all these kinds of deceit. This may warn all that design to peruse these Annals, not to rely upon any of his authorities or arguments without examining; and also not to take every thing for primitive and ancient which he pretends to be so. This may suffice for this volume, and (if we proceed) we shall make the like remarks on the following tomes, to shew, that their religion is made up of falsehoods, and cannot be defended without lying and forgery, which is the great support of their evil cause.

Glory be to the God of Truth.

* Baron. An. 361. p. 2. [p. 35. vol. 5. Lucæ, 1739.]

† Baron. An. 388. p. 495.

‡ Baron. An. 368. p. 179.

§ Baron. An. 398. p. 71.

|| Baron. An. 361. § 35. ad 39.

¶ Baron. An. 390. p. 587.

** Baron. An. 360. §. 27, et 28 [p. 7. vol. 5. Lucæ, 1739.]

THE
VIRGIN MARY TRULY REPRESENTED,
AGAINST THE
INVENTIONS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS OF PAPISTS.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND DEATH
OF
THE BLESSED VIRGIN,
ACCORDING TO ROMISH WRITERS,
WITH THE
GROUNDS OF THE WORSHIP PAID TO HER, AND A PREFACE IN
ANSWER TO THE APOLOGY FOR THE CONTEMPLATIONS, ETC.

THE PREFACE.

To J. C., D.D., Author of the Contemplations, &c. and the Apology.

SIR,

I PRESENT you here with a Short Account of the Life and Death of the ever-blessed Virgin, collected from authors truly Catholic, and zealous devotees such as, in all likelihood, had long ago performed your eight acts of special devotion towards her. If I could have got myself to have made some resolutions, some affections, praises, versicles, responses, lessons and anthems, to have turned Psalms of David from our Lord to our Lady, and composed some hobbling hymns, with a covenant at the last, I am persuaded this book might have passed for a second edition with some alterations, of Contemplations on the life and glory of holy Mary. There is so near an affinity between the doctrines of them both, the authors are so very like, the matter and substance of them is so very much the same, that I think I have sufficient claim to your patronage ;

and may reasonably shelter myself under the protection of your Apology, which will serve for one, as well as the other ; and I cannot but congratulate the good fortune of my book, that it was born with its defence ready made. To give you my judgment freely on the matter, I verily believe your two books are a more fair and full exposition of the doctrine of the Council of Trent in this point, than what our Representer, Mons. de Meaux, or his Vindicator have given us ; because the universal practice of your Church is concordant with, and correspondent to your principles, but by no means to theirs. For what an intolerable injury must there be done to plain natural sense, what extreme violence must there be used, to pull and reduce to a plain *Ora pro Nobis*, such noble and exalted flights, such vast, exuberant, seraphical and super-eminential strains, as are every where to be met withal in the authors of the Virginal Sodality ?

“ And thou, O most glorious and powerful mother of God, pity me, and protect me ; for thou art highly acceptable to God, canst obtain mercies, and wilt procure a mission of angels to relieve me, that my soul may rejoice in thy fulness and bounty.”*

“ Wherefore (for the same reason) now for ever, I choose thee, O glorious mother of Jesus, to be my patroness, advocate, and adoptive mother ; admit me, O powerful queen of angels, amongst thy clients : suppress my enemies ; manage my cause in the court of our requests,”† &c.

“ —And thou, O mother of mercy, dost still solicit my cause at the throne of thy Son’s bounty, art watchful over my motions, and dost compassionate my failings. Help, quicken, triumph over my weak desires. Take me into the arms of thy pity. Suffer not the image of Jesus to be razed forth my spirit, since I have been redeemed, washed and watered with the blood of Jesus, taken forth of the centre of thy amorous heart.”‡

“ Unto thy custody I commit and recommend myself, with all the powers, passions, and motions of my body and mind ; and all living and dead ; humbly entreating thee, through all thy mercies and merits, privileges and power, and by whatever is dearest unto thee, that we may be admitted to be thy children, servants, and devotees ; that we may be protected, directed

* Contemplations, p. 86.

† Ibid.

‡ P. 99.

and assisted, and comforted by thee ; and that by thee we may be presented to God the Father who created us," &c.*

You will scorn, I think, to have such sentences as these (and greater yet than these, if I had leisure to select them) reduced to a poor *Ora pro Nobis*. But your comfort is, that those dry, insipid *Ora pro Nobis* gentlemen are but very few in number, and dare hardly shew themselves but in the days and kingdoms of conversion. But for a couple of unreasonable men, commend me to the modern opposers of your Contemplations,† the one a Friendly Trimmer, (*Speculum B. Virg.*) the other an open Vigilantian (Answer to a Catholic misrepresented). With the first, join all those misbelievers,‡ who will not away with sound and wholesome meats, unless they be also toothsome, who so trim in this great point of Christian piety towards the holy mother of Jesus, as to reduce the whole design of the worship of saints to a bare admiration, commemoration, and imitation of their virtues ; as if the veneration of the saints, and our mediation of intercession,§ directed mediately or immediately unto them were not in themselves Christian virtues, or that the practice of these virtues were not due by us, to their high rank, &c.

The only way to be revenged on this unreasonable and fearful Trimmer (that I can think of), will be to prove in any tolerable manner, the truth of the foregoing period ; and the least that he can do, will be to break his *Speculum* all to pieces ; it may be something else.

And next, for that other open Vigilantian,|| to come and thank you civilly for publishing, in English, *et Permissu Superiorum*, your seasonable treatise, I think it was nothing but a rude affront, for it was indeed to thank you for nothing, since neither the design nor draught was new or singular, i.e. the doctrine and the practice delivered in your book, was from all antiquity, and universal ; if this were made but good, it would crack the heart-strings of that open Vigilantian, which would be a sufficient punishment for his injurious dismembering the very style of the Contemplations,¶ in a most weighty article. Though, after all, some of your friends are apt to think, that the inserting those words "in the soul of a poor creature" which you complain so much of, for being left out, will make your cause never the better, if not somewhat worse ; for that Vigi-

* Contemp. p. 101.

§ P. 14.

† Apol. p. 13.

|| Apol. p. 16.

‡ Ibid.

¶ P. 18.

lantuan thought it but reasonable to inquire, what greater titles, what more glorious attributes, you could bestow on the eternal Son of God in our nature, than you had bestowed on his Virgin mother, although but a pure creature; and the question, for ought I see, is like to be yet unanswered. And therefore, let us leave these two troublesome people, who seem to have no manner of taste or relish of this kind of virginal devotion; and are so wholly taken up with that fanciful way of worshipping one God in simplicity and truth; that I believe if the truth were known, they have neither of them in all their lives suffered one "ecstatic introversion in contemplation of the grandeurs of holy Mary."

Your books, Sir, I find, are made up of two parts: 1. Reasoning. 2. Authority. For the first, I have nothing to say to it; I believe your reasons are as good as any that can be brought in defence of such worship, and such practice. And, if I did not think you would take it amiss, I would thank you again and again for that part of your Apology. For the authoritative part, I confess I am not so well satisfied with it, and it shall be the work of the remainder of this epistle, to shew how little reason you have to be so, in relation to the three or four first centuries; and here I am in very good earnest, and cannot help expostulating with you, and others your writing brethren, in the name both of the learned and unlearned of our nation. Bishop Bonner could not allow a heretic to be a gentleman; and Cardinal Pallavicini says,* "that whereas, since the Reformation, there have been a very great number of Catholics, exceedingly renowned both for their piety and learning; the heresy could not shew even one famous for the first, and not many for the latter." I am afraid that a hundred years hence, heretics will be born without noses and shall not be able so much as to learn to read: but had not rage and fury blinded the eyes of that Jesuit, he might have found a thousand, and ten thousand too, dear both to God and men, both for their piety and their learning. It is very well known how quickly that dawning of learning in the world, about the end of the fifteenth century, brought forth the Reformation; and it is as well known, how kind the daughter has since proved to the mother. And envy must confess, that England has made as great improvements in all arts and sciences, and advanced learning of all kinds, as far as any nation in the world besides

* Apparat. cap. 7.

has done. But what is this, you will say, to you? I answer, very much. It lies upon you very hard, to acquit yourselves either of profound ignorance in books, or extreme disingenuity, in imposing spurious, scoundrel, and exploded tracts, for genuine and approved. What greater rudeness and affront can you put upon a nation of so exact a judgment, so critical a taste, and such abundant reading, as the English is, than to think you can foist your wretched stuff upon them for old authentic records? But this is your way, and this is your advantage, that if but one ignorant reader is seduced by these false authorities, you have gained one; and if you gain none, you lose nothing; for disingenuous and unfair dealing in the methods of converting, is so frequent, that a right Catholic stomach never so much as rises at it, much less is in any danger of revolt.

I am tempted to pursue this subject somewhat farther; but I will restrain myself, and set about my work immediately, which shall be to shew, that of all the authorities you have alleged in defence of your doctrine, for the three first ages, either the books from which you have them are confessedly spurious, or exceeding doubtful; or if the books be genuine, the citations are nothing to your purpose.

To begin therefore with the testimonies of the first age; the holy Scriptures, which are cited abundantly, are most of them such as prove, what no body denies, as that Mary* was the mother of Jesus, her excellent faith, admirable purity, profound humility, perfect obedience, fidelity and obsequiousness, fortitude and patience, ay, and whatever else you please that is truly excellent, we are ready to believe, though sometimes not from the places brought by you: but why should you say she is styled the spouse of the Holy Ghost, because Matth. i. 20, † “that which is born of her is of the Holy Ghost?” How do the Evangelists recommend to us her fervent practice of ecstatic prayer, because Acts i. 14, ‡ “These all continued in prayer and supplication with one accord, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren?” But how does that submissive resignation of the humble and obedient maid, Luke i. 38, § “Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word,” prove the amplitude of the spiritual power of holy Mary, in the empire of grace and divine favours, suiting to her illustrious prerogatives, virtues, and merits? Where is the stupendous efficacy of her single fiat, be it done,

* Apol. 90.

† Ap. 89.

‡ P. 90.

§ P. 91.

in those words? J. C., D.D., of the holy order of St. Francis, will tell us :* “As God’s fiat in the beginning of nature was a demonstrative mark of his proper omnipotency, in extracting the whole fabric of the world, with all its moveables and ornaments, out of a mere nothing : so Mary’s fiat in the beginning of grace, is an evident token of her appropriated plenitude of power, proportioned to her fulness of grace, co-operating with the Almighty Source of all goodness, gives a being, with all con-natural parts and perfections, to Jesus.” Commend me to J. C. for making the most of a thing : but this it is, to have one’s head stuffed with the conformities of St. Francis. Well,† but the efficacy of her mediation of intercession to God, for mortals, appears manifestly in her solicitous request to Jesus, at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, John ii. 3, “The mother of Jesus saith unto him, *They* have no wine.” Had I been J. C. of all places in the whole Bible, I would never have singled out this passage, to shew the efficacy of her mediation of intercession, because of the answer immediately following, ver. 4, “Woman, what have I to do with thee?” Ay, but hold, says J. C.‡ Did not our blessed Lord, for the insurance of our protection by holy Mary, and of her effectual mediation to himself for us, give a most ample instance, in his voluntary subjection and obsequiousness to her commands, from the age of twelve to thirty, Luke ii. 51, “And he went down with them to Nazareth, and was subject to them?” Now, to speak the truth, I can see no great matter in these plain words, and if there be any thing in them extraordinary, it is certainly as applicable to St. Joseph as the blessed Virgin ; and therefore J. C. took care to translate them to his purpose, “Jesus went down with Mary to Nazareth, and was subject to her.” But it is no unusual fraud of the adversaries of the Catholic Church§ to lop the sacred Scriptures themselves, thereby to support a drooping party and passion ; no, not this, to speak of ! The party indeed we have to deal with does not droop very much, but certainly the cause does, that wants such supports as these. In the next place, the application of the 44th (with us the 45th) Psalm, to the Virgin Mary, upon the authorities of St. Athanasius (*Serm. de Deipara*) and Greg. Nazian. (*Traged. de Ch. Patiente*) is hardly to be endured, when the literal sense of it is so suitable to the love of Solomon to his Egyptian lady, and the mystical, to that of our blessed Lord to his spouse the Church.

* Ibid.

† P. 92.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ap. p. 18.

But if these two pieces[†] (of which I shall speak in their proper places) were sufficient to authorise your applying that Psalm* to the Virgin, yet what shall authorize you to construe, *Vultum tuum deprecabuntur*, by, "shall pay homage to this divine mother," and set it down as the words of the Psalmist? Nothing that I know of, but *Quidlibet audendi libertas pro sancta matre Ecclesia*. And thus I have done my observations (for I do not pretend to answer or confute the reason of the authorities alleged here, or elsewhere) on your Scripture quotations. And truly, if this be the use that is to be made of it, I think it reasonable, it should be withholden not from the laity alone, but clergy also.

The first[†] authority, purely human, is the honourable testimony of St. Andrew the Apostle, who styles her an immaculate Virgin, in these words, "It was necessary that Christ, born of an immaculate Virgin, should restore that life everlasting which all had forfeited." Here is nothing in this citation but what we all agree very well in; but the authority of the piece we think very questionable, and because it is made use of upon other occasions by your writers, and the Putney Convert, I will give you some of the reasons, for which we think it not authentic. Sixtus Senensis says nothing of it, but gives us warning to be cautious in such matters (quoting Eusebius for it) as relate to the acts and passions of the Apostles, and says, that in the acts of St. Andrew there are abundance of ridiculous stories, about Egeas, and Maximilla, &c. Possevin and Bellarmine think there is all the reason in the world to believe the passion of St. Andrew genuine: 1st. Because no body had questioned it. And how should they, when it had not long been made common, by the translation of Cardinal Sirlet, Gentian Hervet, and another, from the Greek of Simeon Metaphrastes, at the request of Lippomannus, bishop of Verona, from whom Surius took it? 2. Because it has nothing of novelty in it. If the Church of Rome will let *Spiritus sanctum, procedentem ex Patre, in Filio permanentem*, pass for the doctrine of St. Andrew, I have nothing to answer. Let them choose which they please; for that of Baronius,[‡] saying it had lately crept into some copies, and was not in a great many others, will not go far with us, barely upon his credit. 3. Because the famous hymn *Salve sancta Crux*, was undoubtedly taken from this passion of St. Andrew. That it might very well be, and yet

* Apol. p. 93.

† P. 94.

‡ Martyrolog. 30 Nov.

the *Passio S. And.* never the more genuine, unless it could be proved that this hymn were fifteen or sixteen hundred years old. 4. Because Johannes a Lovanio, Aloysius Lippomannus, and the correctors of the Roman Breviary, think it a very genuine piece. To this Bellarmine shall answer, namely, that he knew a great man (that will go for two sure), that called this passion into question : and farther, that it was very vigorously disputed by grave and learned men, before it could pass. 5. Petrus Damiani (who died 1072), and St. Bernard, in a sermon on the Vigil and Feast of St. Andrew (which Labbé knows not if it be his or no), cite this piece as authentic. We have nothing to say to this, but that it might pass for true in the days of St. Bernard, and before. But the question is, if it be the presbyters of Achaia, as is pretended ? To the reasons afore-mentioned Labbéus adds the auxiliari forces of hard words, and vile injurious reproaches on the Protestant authors that had exposed this piece as spurious, and indeed it is all the arguments that he has brought, both in this and other points, against their critics. And whoever shall turn over that Jesuit's books, cannot choose being concerned to find a man of his laborious industry and learning, so agitated by the rabid spirit of his order, as to pass all bounds of moderation and good manners towards men of learning, though differing from him in their judgment. We are more obliged to Mons. du Pin, a late French author, both for his candour and good nature, whose words I will set down at full, concerning this present matter.

“Opinions are divided about the acts of the passion of St. Andrew,* written by the presbyters of Achaia, which are in Surius's History of the Saints, Nov. 30. Baronius, Bellarmine, and some other Catholic critics receive them, but a great many more reject them. The ancients knew no other acts of St. Andrew, than such as were corrupted by the Manichees, of which St. Augustine, Philastrius, and Pope Innocent I. make mention, and which Gelasius puts into the number of apocryphal books.† But it is certain, that those were not the same with these we are now speaking of ; and it is yet as certain, that these later acts of the passion of St. Andrew were never cited by any that lived before the 7th or 8th century. Such as Remigius Autissiodorensis, who died about 900, Petrus Damiani, 1072, Lanfranc, St. Bernard, and Ivo of Chartres. By which we see we cannot be assured of the truth of it. Thirdly, not only the

* Nouvelle Bibliotheque, p. 47.

† Du Pin, p. 47.

mystery of the Trinity is explained in these acts, in such a manner as we may well suspect they were made since the Council of Nice;* but they also teach the error of the later Greeks-concerning the Holy Ghost, saying, he proceeds from the Father, and abides in the Son. I know it is pretended, that there are manuscripts in which this passage is not found, but who can tell whether these passages were not rather blotted or left out of some copies, than added or put into others? And therefore this passage ought at least to be looked upon as a doubtful thing, and such as St. Jerome says we may not make any use of to prove any matter of faith." Thus far that learned person, and we thank him for his ingenuity. And has J. C., D. D., or any of his writing brethren, anything material to say to all this? When they have, let them quote Aloys. Lipom. *e Presb. Achaiae* again, but not before. But setting aside the authority of these learned people, let any ingenuous, any uninfected man, set himself to read this piece, and if he do not find enough to make him suspect it I am very much mistaken; there he will find Egeas telling St. Andrew,† how the *Principes Romani*, the Roman Emperors, had ordered the Christian religion to be rooted out. After great disputes, Egeas puts Andrew in prison; but upon the hearing of it, all the people of the province came to the Apostle and would have broken up his prison and freed him, and were hardly restrained by St. Andrew from going presently to kill Egeas; but he preached a sermon of Passive Obedience (for which I do not find they laughed at him) to the people, and so the pro-consul escaped. Amongst other things St. Andrew tells Egeas, "that Christ had sent him to that province, where he had converted a mighty number of people from idolatry." "Ay," says Egeas, "I know you have; there is not a city in all Achaia whose temples are not quite forsaken and empty since your preaching; and therefore I will make you sacrifice first, that all who have been seduced by you may return to their old worship." Is there anything likely in all this? Did the people use to gather together so early in defence of Christianity against their own governors? Were not the Christians the hate and scorn of all the world? Were not the judges and governors forced to restrain the rage of the common people in their persecutions of the poor saints? And how came all things so mightily changed in Achaia? that all the heathen

* P. 48.

† Surius, Nov. 30.

temples should in a manner be quite deserted in so little a time, will not easily be believed by any who understand the state of those times. After St. Andrew had hung upon the cross two days, Egeas came, at the clamour of his own brother Stratocles, and twenty thousand followers, to take him down, but the good Apostle prayed to Christ that they might not be able to do it, and as many as stretched out their arms to try, *stupēbant*, and could not.

What follows, seems to me to be done purely in imitation of Joseph of Arimathea, and is thus : how a certain woman, called Maximilla, an honourable person (*Senatrix*, to answer to *Βουλευτής*, Luke xxiii. 50), a chaste and holy matron (to answer to Joseph, a just and honourable man), as soon as she knew the Apostle was dead, came to the cross, and with all reverence took down the body of the Apostle, and buried it with spices and ointments, and laid him in a sepulchre which she had prepared for herself. At this Egeas was in burning wrath, and ordering a bill of complaint (an indictment of riot, against the peace of his Sovereign Lord) to be drawn up to the Emperor against Maximilla, and 20,000 of the people, was, in the midst of his anger, caught up by the devil into the air, and thrown down headlong into the midst of the forum, and died presently. Whose estate his brother Stratocles would never touch, because his brother had polluted it with killing the Apostle. These things were done in Patræ of Achaia, *ubi præstantur adhuc gloriosa ejus beneficia usque in præsentem diem*. And this example so terrified all the country, that they turned Christians immediately. I hope our English missionaries, after this, will be so ingenuous as to lay aside the passion of St. Andrew. Your next authority is fetched from St. Peter's liturgy, of which Sixtus Senensis, Possevinus, and Bellarmine, say not one word ; and Labbeus says enough to let you see he is persuaded it is none of his ; and thinks it so plain, that there is no need of consulting Protestant critics for arguments against it ; but I would not have the reader think he calls them Protestant critics ; no, *Allophylos bacchantes consulere, profanos Criticos, Alastoras Hæreticos, Beelzebub Deum Accaron consultum ire*, are the best words we can get from him. But let us hear what Cardinal Bona says on this matter, *Rer. Liturg.* l. 1. c. 8. "About the end of the last century, Gulielmus Lindanus, from Cardinal Sirlet's copy, put out the liturgy of St. Peter, Greek and Latin, with a learned apology for it ; but whoever shall read it carefully, will, with me, confess, that nothing can be

concluded hence, but that Peter, by word of mouth, or writing, delivered a liturgy to the Church of Antioch first, and then to that of Rome : but that this (which he says Sirlet found in Apulia)* should be it, he by no means proves ; and nobody will believe it who can distinguish truth from falsehood ; for if this were St. Peter's liturgy indeed, how comes it to pass, that the Roman Church, which amidst so many storms of persecution, hath carefully preserved his relics and epistles, should yet neglect this noble formula of sacrificing ? How comes it, there was nothing seen of it for 1500 or more years in the Catholic writings ?" And thus that Cardinal goes on at a mighty rate : but because the afore-mentioned Ellies Du Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne, and at present in great repute with the Church of France, hath dispatched this business effectually, and made use of Cardinal Bona's arguments, and because I find I grow tedious, I will take leave to translate a short chapter of his, which will give you full satisfaction in the point of liturgies, and will also be an answer to your third citation out of the liturgy of St. James Minor.

Of Liturgies falsely attributed to the Apostles, Page 21.

" We need only to reflect a little on the celebration of the eucharist, in St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and on what Justin Martyr, and others of the first ecclesiastic writers have delivered down on that subject, to be persuaded that the Apostles and their successors celebrated the sacrifice of the mass with great simplicity. This is what has been observed by all who have written on the liturgies, who agree, that mass was, in the first days, performed without much ceremony, and a very few prayers made use of ; but that by little and little both prayers and ceremonies increased, to conciliate the greater reverence to the sacrifice. At last the Churches ordered and set down in writing the manner of celebrating, which was called the liturgy. And the reason of their differing proceeded from their conforming to the several usages and customs of several places. And because men are naturally carried to change something in their exterior part of worship, there have therefore many things been added from time to time to these liturgies.* This remark alone may suffice to let you see, that the liturgies

* Nouvelle Bibl.

which carry the Apostles' names, and Evangelists', are truly none of theirs ; but to prove it invincibly, we need only examine them one after another.

"The liturgy, or Greek and Latin mass, attributed to St. Peter, and published by Lindanus, 1589, from Cardinal Sirlet's manuscript, which was not very old, and which has since been printed at Paris by Morellius, 1595, cannot be St. Peter's, for the following reasons. There is mention made of St. Sixtus, Cornelius, and St. Cyprian (the last of which died 258). The Virgin Mary is there called the mother of God, Θεοτόκος, a term which was not in common use before the condemnation of Nestorius." (Cardinal Bona, in his defence of St. James's liturgy, quotes Evagrius and Theodoret, confessing that the ancient Fathers both called the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος, and believed her to be so. But certainly St. Cyril of Alexandria, who was present at, and a great part of the Church of Ephesus, in 431, did not believe the Apostles St. Peter and St. James to have ever called her so, when he says in his Epistle about the Θεοτόκος, ταύτην ἡμῖν πίστιν παρέδωσαν οἱ Θεσπέσιοι μαθηταί, ἂν εἰ μὴ τῆς λέξεως πεποιήνται μνήμην. The admirable disciples have delivered us down this faith, though they have not made mention of the word or term Θεοτόκος. Therefore St. Cyril did not know of any liturgy of St. Peter or St. James, where Θεοτόκος is mentioned. But this by the way, and now to Du Pin again.) "The Canon of the Latin Mass, which St. Gregory says was made by a *scholasticus*, i.e. a learned man of the fifth century, is there inserted entire ; besides, it has prayers in it, taken out of Gregory's Sacramentary, St. Basil's and St. Chrysostom's liturgies. There they pray for the Patriarch, a term not known before the end of the fourth century, and for the most religious Emperors. In a word, had this liturgy been St. Peter's, the Church of Rome would have made use of it, and it could not have been unknown for so many ages. These reasons made the learned Cardinal Bona say, this liturgy was spurious, and had certainly been composed by some Greek priest Latinized, because it was taken partly from the Greek and partly from the Latin liturgies, and then was christened St. Peter's, either to gain it more authority, or because it contained a great part of the Roman liturgy.

"The Ethiopic liturgy, that bears the name of St. Matthew, is visibly supposititious ; there they pray for the popes, for kings, for patriarchs and archbishops ; the twelve Apostles are there

invoked ; there they mention the Four Evangelists ; speak of the Synods of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus ; there they sing the Nicene Creed with the particule *Filioque* ; there they mention Athanasius, Basil, and St. Gregory, the Epact, Golden Number, and Trisagion, by which we see this liturgy was of later date.

“There remains no more but the liturgy attributed to St. James, which men of learning have taken pains to defend, but to no purpose ; for though it be ancients than those we have examined, since it is cited by the Council in Trullo, after the fifth General Council (held according to Petavius in 707), yet, however, we cannot say that St. James was the author, or that it was made in his time. For, 1st, the Virgin is in this liturgy called the mother of God ; the Son and Holy Ghost are said to be consubstantial with the Father, terms which were not in use in St. James’s time ; for if they had, is it credible that this authority would not have been alleged in the Councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Constantinople ? 2. We find here the Trisagion, and the Gloria Patri, which were not commonly used in the Church till the fifth century ; for though you should prove they were used before, yet you must own, that it was not the common custom of the Church so to do. 3. There they pray for such as were shut up in monasteries ; but who can say there were monasteries in St. James’s time ? 4. There is mention made of confessors, a term not used in the divine offices till a great while after St. James, even in Cardinal Bellarmine’s own judgment. 5. This liturgy speaks of temples, and incensing of altars, and does any one believe there were such things so early ? 6. The whole liturgy is full of citations out of St. Paul’s epistles, most of which were written after the death of St. James. And one cannot fairly say with the Cardinals Bellarmine and Bona (and Labbé), that these things were added to St. James’s liturgy ; because there is no manner of likelihood, people should add so many passages ; and besides, the ceremonies throughout the whole do by no means agree with the Apostles’ days.” Thus far Du Pin, and I hope you will either credit or confute him. I durst not for my life venture any authors with you, but genuine Catholics, and therefore I have not so much as looked on Perkins, Cooke, Rivet, Aubertin, Blondel, or Daillé, with several others, for fear you should apprehend any foul play.

And now I leave you and your brethren to consider on the liturgies, and pass to your last citation out of Dionysius the

Areopagite : not that I intend any thing against the words, but to let you see how little reason you have to believe those books which pass under Denis's name, to be his, notwithstanding you have a great many learned men on your side. Sixtus Senensis, and Possevinus, are positive in the point, and so is Bellarmine, although the first acknowledges that Cardinal Cajetan, and the third Constantine Council, believed otherwise. and the latter, that Valla and Erasmus (*quidam scioli*) thought otherwise ; O great Apollo ! who would not pass for a dunce, when Valla and Erasmus pass for smatterers ! But Cardinal Pallavicini, lib. 1. cap. 23, has thrown the latter as low as a man can go, but at the same time he falls himself into the lowest degree of contempt, with every understanding reader. Ph. Labbeus has, I know not how, obtained of himself to be indifferent in the case. And Casimir Oudin,* a late ingenious moderate critic, lays the matter down so fairly and plainly, that though he does not expressly say it, yet you may easily conclude his opinion of the book to be, that it is spurious. But Du Pin has done the business effectually, and therefore I will not grudge the pains of making an abstract of his judgment, from the reasons following.

1. The manner of these books† first appearing looks suspicious ; they were unknown to all antiquity, and at last produced by the Severiani, heretics, in a conference held with the catholic bishops at Constantinople, in the Emperor's palace, in 532, to support their errors by. But what do the catholics say to this ? How can you shew us (say they to the heretics), that these testimonies you say are Dionysius's, are so indeed ? Had they been so, they could not have been unknown to blessed Cyril. But why do we mention St. Cyril ? for if St. Athanasius had believed them to be St. Denis's, would he not have made use of that authority, to prove the consubstantiality of the blessed Trinity, against the blasphemies of Arius ? But now since none of the ancients have cited them, how can you prove them to belong to Dionysius ? Thus that Council argued then ; but afterwards, finding nothing in the books repugnant to the faith, they were admitted for genuine. But Du Pin could not find that the Council had taken care to answer their own arguments and objections. To this he adds, that they are wholly omitted by St. Jerome and St. Augustine, whose purposes they would have served very well, had they known them.

* Supplement. de Script. Ecc. Paris. 1686.
VOL. XV.

† Du Pin, p. 90.

2. The style and method* are very different from the way of writing in the first and second age of the Church. The style is puffed, affected, and unnatural; the meanest and simplest things are amplified extravagantly; the periods are artificial, and his reasons ranged in great order, which looks more like a philosopher, writing at leisure and with premeditation.

3. The subject of these books does not at all agree with the times of St. Denis. The Christians in the first ages were taken up in three sorts of works, in making apologies for their religion, in letters of instruction to the faithful, and exhorting them to martyrdom; and lastly, in writing against heretics. Now the subject and design of Denis all along is clear another thing; it is to speak of mysteries in the most exquisite and curious manner possible, to explain them by Plato's principles, and in the terms of that school, not to propose them with the simplicity of the ancients, but to find out all sorts of difficulties, and answer them; to raise questions, more nice than useful, concerning the nature of God, and the different orders of angels. He explains the Trinity clearer than Athanasius himself; he rejects dexterously the errors of the Nestorians, Eutychians, and Anthropomorphites; he speaks of the Church as flourishing, and in peace, and makes no mention of martyrs or persecutions. In the last chapter of the Hierarchy, he defends the baptism of infants by ancient tradition. "We say (says he) hereupon, that which our bishops (taught by ancient tradition) have delivered down to us." Tradition must needs be very ancient in St. Denis's days! He describes the ceremonies of solemn baptism, such as were in use when the Church was freed from persecutions, with a great deal of pomp. He speaks of temples built expressly, in which there was a sanctuary separate from the other parts, of incensing of altars, and ceremonies used about the Energumeni, Catechumeni, and Penitents. He speaks of monks, and describes their way of consecrating. He dedicates a book to Timothy, and quotes in it an epistle of Ignatius; now Timothy was dead, and Onesimus in his place, when Ignatius wrote his epistles. He cites and explains the Gospel, and Revelations of St. John, as canonical and authentic, which was not received for such (the Revelations that is) for some ages after; and St. John had hardly written them in St. Denis's lifetime. He quotes the epistle of Ignatius to the Romans, written a little before his martyrdom, which was in Trajan's time, 108, when all agree

* Du Pin, p. 92.

that Denis himself suffered in Domitian's time, unless those who, to reconcile this contradiction, have lengthened out his days to 109 and 118, without any good grounds; little thinking that the lower they removed him, so much the nearer they came to the truth. He quotes a passage out of one Clement a philosopher, which is found in the eighth book of Clemens Alex. Strom. that lived in the third century. I am weary of confirming the spuriousness of Dionysius. He who is not satisfied with what is already set down, must read Du Pin himself, who has treated this matter so fully, and yet in short, that he has left nothing to doubt of.

And thus I have dispatched, I think, your honourable testimonies of the first age, by shewing, that there is not one of them genuine and authentic, even in the judgment of authors of your own communion.

Your testimonies of the second age are fetched indeed from genuine authors, but I will leave any man to judge how fairly you have represented them.

The first is a passage out of Irenæus, which you have given us by halves, and therefore I will set it down at full as I find it, lib. 5. c. 19. in a barbarous translation. "As the one (Eve) was seduced by the words of the devil (*per Angelicum sermonem*) to fly from God, prevaricating his word, so the other (Mary) was told by an angel (*per Angelicum sermonem evangelicatum*) that she should bear God, obeying his word; and as the one was seduced to fly from God, so was the other induced to obey God; that the Virgin Mary might become the advocate of the Virgin Eve (not as you have translated it, of the guilty children of Eve), and as mankind was bound over to death by a virgin, it might be also by a virgin loosed; the virgin-obedience of one being fairly set against the virgin-disobedience of the other." If Irenæus means to be understood literally, as you seem to think, I should not doubt to say he was grossly mistaken; for it was certainly the obedience of Christ Jesus, God-man alone, that could be fairly set against the disobedience of our first parents, and by whom our debt was paid, and we set free from the bonds of everlasting death; but take the whole parallel in any tolerable sense, and make what you can of *advocata*.

If you want any farther satisfaction about this citation, I refer you to a Discourse concerning the Worship of the blessed Virgin and the Saints, printed 1686, where you may find it; as also on your following one out of Tertullian, where

you may find the true translation of the Latin words set down by you (Apol. p. 97), which you seem to be utterly ignorant of.

Your third quotation is out of Justin Martyr,* where you say (Apol. p. 97), he doth in express words vindicate this age of the Church from the imputation of atheism imposed by Pagans for the practice of saint-servitude, acknowledging the fact, but denying and refuting the crime, in that Christians give them, not divine, but only saint-worship, Just. Martyr, Ap. 2. Good God! that ever any reasonable creature should be thus imposed on! the Christians called atheists, for practising saint-servitude! acknowledging their saint-worship, but denying it to be a fault! distinguishing betwixt *latreutic* and *douleutic* worship! Let me live and die a barbarous monk, if I know what to say to you; or if I am not ashamed at my heart to confute a D. D. in a matter so plain. Had the modern saint-worship prevailed in Justin Martyr's time, the Christians had never been called or thought atheists for many good reasons. But, Sir, when I have given you the true translation of the passage in Justin, I will leave you to the instruction and correction of your superiors, if you are ignorant of your mistakes; but if not, to the checks of your own conscience, and to the punishment you owe to violated truth and honesty. "Although (says the Father) we profess ourselves atheists with respect to those whom you look upon as gods, yet not in respect of the true God, the parent and fountain of wisdom and righteousness, and all other excellencies and perfections, who is infinitely free from the least contagion or spot of evil. Him and his only begotten Son (who came from him, and taught these things both to us and to the company of good angels, who follow and are conformable to his will) and the spirit of prophecy (i. e. the Holy Ghost), we worship and adore, honouring them in truth and with the highest reason," &c.

We are now come to the testimonies of the third age, St. Cyprian, Eusebius Alexandrinus (whom I cannot in all my catalogues of authors discover), Origen, and Methodius; of the three first I shall say nothing, because I think they have said nothing themselves; when their passages are produced, you may receive satisfaction: but because abundance of your modern authors have quoted St. Cyprian *de Cæna Domini*, and think it very ancient at least, as Mr. Selater and

* Apology for Contempl. p. 97.

the convert of late, in Reason and Authority ; I shall shew you, in short, in what esteem it is held by your own authors. Bellarmine disowns it, but will have it an ancient and learned author's. Labbeus places it where it should be, with Arnoldus Abbas Bonævallis, who flourished about 1160. O! wonderful antiquity! a little more than five hundred years old! Casimir Oudin gives him the same place, and so does Du Pin. And this is the grave gentleman that is brought in to be an author of the third century. Of Methodius, the last, but only testimony of this age produced in words by you, I have this to inform you, that Sixtus Senensis and Bellarmine say nothing of this piece. Possevin likes it well. Labbé gives it us in the edition of Combefis, 1644, but passes no judgment on it. Du Pin says it was never cited by the ancients, nor numbered up by Photius; but yet has somewhat of his style, only more swelling, and more full of epithets; he explains the mysteries of the Trinity, incarnation, the divinity of the Word (whom he calls consubstantial to the Father abundance of times), the Trisagion, and the virginity of blessed Mary even after her bringing forth Jesus Christ, and original sin, so clearly, that there is reason to doubt if nothing was added to this sermon after its first composition. But let us see what reasons Casimir Oudin, p. 22, can bring for his fathering this piece on one Methodius,* patriarch of Constantinople in the year 840.

1. This oration was pronounced in some great Council or assembly, where abundance of bishops were met (whom he calls honourable fathers and brethren) to celebrate that festival with great joy; which agrees very ill with the times of persecution, in which Methodius the elder lived, under Diocletian and Maximian, by whom he was martyred, 302 or 303, but all things agree with the times of Methodius the younger. 2. The oration has in it (speaking to Christ) Thou art the True Light of the True Light, very God of very God, which plainly alludes to that expression in the Nicene Creed, before the making of which Methodius was long dead. 3. He plainly falls upon Nestorius, and confutes his heresy at every turn; he affects on purpose to call often on the Virgin Mary, by the name of Mother of God; but Nestorius's heresy was condemned an hundred and thirty years after Methodius's time. 4. There is so near an affinity between this oration and the rest of Methodius junior's works, that an egg is not liker an

* Supplem.

egg; and Oudin instances in some particulars. 5. The author thus speaks, "Before Thee there was no other God, the Son of God the Father, and after Thee there shall be no other Son consubstantial to the Father;" which very term argues the author to have lived after the Nicene Council, therefore not Methodius.

Thus have I finished what I engaged for, as to the testimonies of the three first ages, and though I intended to take the testimonies of the fourth age into some kind of examination also, yet because I find I have already taken too much liberty, I will ease both you and myself, when I have told you, that St. Basil hath three liturgies which go under his name; and Cardinal Bona says, Gœar (who wrote learnedly on liturgies) complains how hard it is to discern the genuine true text of St. Basil,* from the additions made by later hands; he says the like also of St. Chrysostom's liturgy, so that you must not be too confident. Cardinal Bellarmine passes the censure of lightness on Gregory Nazianzen's tragedy, *Christus Patiens*, out of which you had your quotation, and pray remember it is poetry. The epistle of St. Jerome, 10 *ad Paul. et Eustoch.* is expressly rejected by Possevin. The sermon *de laudibus Mariæ*, out of which you cite your testimony, is rejected by Petavius and Labbeus, as none of Epiphanius's. And lastly, the *Sermo de Sanctiss. Deipara* you cite under St. Athanasius's name, is cast by, for abundance of reasons given by Baronius and Bellarmine; Oudin shall shut up all.† *De Sanctissima Deipara Virgine.—Opus de quo dubitant Baronius et Bellarminus, sed Spinellus et Maraccius fulcire, atque Athanasio vindicare conantur; hoc ordinarium est valde Devotis, ut inter extases suas (exstatic introversions) non habeant gustum: sed indiscriminatim omnia approbent satisfaciencia suis extaticis excessibus, uti hac in parte contigit Spinello et Maraccio (et J. C. D. D.) Marianis Devotis.* All the English I shall give this is, that it is a *Speculum* for J. C. D. D. of the holy order of St. Francis, made by one Casimir Oudin, a friendly trimmer.

And now, since I have been all this while clearing honest authors of the spurious brats laid to their charge, it is but fit I should let you know that the following piece is none of my own, but a learned and renowned Frenchman's, which I have dressed up in English, with some little alteration of the style, and addition of some little matters. If you shall think fit to

* Bona Rerum Lit. l. 1. c. 9. [p. 192. Venet. 1764.]

† Supplem. p. 32.

answer either the preface or the book, you must only clear the authorities I have been calling in question, and there's an end. For I assure you, I intend to make no other answer to you than Mr. W. of Oxford does to his opponents, *viz.* by translating the Conformities of St. Francis, by honest Bartholomew of Pisa; and when that is answered, I will write the life of Pope Alexander VI., with a discourse at the end, of the Contineny of the Roman Clergy; and then a discourse of the Church-government under Donna Olympia, in which I shall make out, that the worship or adoration paid to her by her brother-in-law, Pope Innocent X., was somewhat more than saint-servitude.

Thus, Sir, (beseeching you in the name of God, and for the sake of common Christianity, to propagate no more this doctrine and this practice, so grievous and afflicting to the reformed world, and which makes our holy religion the scorn and scandal of all Jews, Turks, and Infidels) I remain

Your humble Servant.

An Account of the Life and Death of the Blessed Virgin.

ALL the service that is paid to the blessed Virgin, is founded (as they love to speak) upon the greatnesses of Mary, *i. e.* upon the glorious privileges she received from God in her conception, birth, life, death, resurrection, and pretended assumption. Of these her greatnesses we find no mention at all in Holy Scripture, and I am persuaded there is some mystery and secret reason of divine providence in the silence of the Evangelists, who tell us nothing of the birth, the life or death of the mother of Jesus Christ; she appears but in four or five passages of the Gospel, from the birth of our Saviour; and even some of them are such, as make not much for her greatness. Such, for example, is that which happened at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, where, undertaking to inform our Lord there was no more wine left to entertain the guests, she received an answer, to our thinking, very hard: "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." And like to this is that other passage of the Gospel, where she stood without with his brethren, with purpose he should come and speak with her. But to those who brought the message, he returned this answer, "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?" and went not, that we know of. This does not very well agree

with that profound respect, and reverend manner of deportment, with which (they say) he treats her now in heaven. This silence of the Evangelists proceeds, unquestionably, from the same reason for which it pleased God to conceal the body of Moses heretofore ; to wit, that the Israelites might not find it out, and make an idol of it. So God was pleased the Evangelists should say no more of her, than was necessary to teach us the mystery of the incarnation ; that men might not (with any show of reason) father on his word, those horrible superstitions which he foresaw and knew Papism and false devotion would one day introduce into the world.

But the Evangelists have got nothing by this their silence of the birth, the life and death of Mary. We know them very well without their help. We have divined and discovered all. God knows how, indeed, but so it is, we have a complete history of the whole. It is true, it is so fabulous, and in some places so shameless, that even the legends of Latona, mother of Apollo and Diana, or of Rhea, called the mother of the gods, cannot possibly be more. In the design of making her a goddess, and allotting her a worship, very near to that we pay to Jesus Christ, there is nothing great and considerable in the birth and death of our Lord the Son, that Papism has forgot to imitate and attribute to the mother, excepting that they have not dared, as yet, to say, she was conceived of the Holy Ghost. Let us therefore see a short abridgment of this legend, which the Greeks (who were always notable men at invention) first began, and to which the Latins (scorning to stay behind) put the finishing hand.

First, then, we have happily learned (but you must not ask me how, or from whom), that the father of the blessed Virgin's name was Joachim, who was of the royal line, her mother's Ann.* Which Ann had two sisters, the one called Mary, and the other Soba, all three daughters of Matan the priest ; for it was necessary that the royal and the priestly line should concentre and meet in her, who was to bring forth him who is our priest and king. From Epiphanius's time,† Joachim and Ann have gone for the father and mother of the blessed Virgin : but revelation (like a snow-ball) still goes on increasing, and we have found since John Damascene's time,‡ who lived in the eighth century, that this Joachim was the son of

* Baronius in *apparatu Annal.*

† *Hæres.* 78, 79. [vol. i. p. 1049. Colon. 1682.]

‡ *J. Damascen.* l. 14. *deOrthod. fide.* cap. 15.

one Barpanther, who was the son of Panther. It is true, these names are not usually found among the Jewish genealogies, nor are of Hebrew extract; but what was that to John Damascene, who neither understood a word of Hebrew, nor thought himself obliged to such exactness? * We are also told, to whom the sisters of this Ann were married, and also what children they had. Mary, the eldest, was married in the town of Bethlehem, and was the mother of Salome the midwife. Soba, that was the second sister, was the mother of Elizabeth the mother of John Baptist, and cousin-german to the Virgin Mary.

Ann, the wife of Joachim, that was to be the mother of the mother of the Saviour of the world (the mother, I say, of her that was to be called our Goddess, our Redeemeress, our Comfortress (for strange things, you know, must have strange names), our Advocate, our Refuge, the Salvation of Christians, the Perfection of the Divinity and Trinity), received all manner of tokens of the future greatness of the child she was to bring into the world. She was barren many years after her marriage, and because they could not find in whom the fault lay, they were both of them cruelly ashamed; and the high priest Isachar rejected the offerings of Joachim, as of a dry and cursed tree, saying to him with indignation, "Cursed is every one that begetteth not a male child in Israel." Baronius† (that understood these things too well, not to know that no such man as Isachar was at that time high priest, and that they did not use to reject the offerings of such men as had barren wives) durst not adopt this passage of the story, although he does the rest. But till his time, none ever dared to call this history into question, but it went for a certain and undoubted truth, upon the pretended authority of St. Jerome. They add furthermore, that Joachim, covered with confusion for the affront the high priest had offered him, resolved never to go home again; and that Ann, deprived of the comfort of her husband, betook herself to her prayers, that God would please to send him back, and to take away this her reproach. And hereupon it was, that Bernardin de Bustis‡ made that pious and ingenious application of the words of Moses to Joachim and Ann. "In the beginning God made heaven and

* Niceph. lib. 2. cap. 3.

† Pseudo Hieronym. ad Heliod. et Chromat.

‡ Mariate Part 2. Ser. 3. Pelbart de Temeswar. in Stellario, l. 1. part. 1. c. 11.

earth: By heaven (says he) we must understand the Virgin Mary, the lady of the world. And God said, Let there be light: that is (says he) let Mary be begotten, and be born." Poor Joachim, overwhelmed with grief, went and hid himself in the wilderness, where continuing forty days in prayer and fasting, an angel at last appeared to him, and promised him the birth of Mary, giving him this for a token, that in going home, he should meet his wife at a certain gate of Jerusalem, called the Gilded Gate. Ann at the same time pouring forth her prayers and tears, was got into the holy of holies, to get as near as she could to the throne of God. Indeed, no woman yet had entered into that sacred place, and even among men, it was the privilege of the high-priest alone to do it, and that but once a year, on the great feast of propitiation. But what might not she do, who was to be the mother of the Virgin? And who should have dared to shut the door against her? Hither then the angel came, and declared to her the birth of Mary, and ordered her to go and meet her husband in such a place. It was the angel Gabriel that performed this office, as Bernardin de Bustis, and Bartholomew of Pisa, authors of sovereign and unquestionable authority both assure us: who add moreover, that he received this commission of God with joy incredible; and that, returning into heaven, the whole choir of angels set themselves to dance and sing for joy, having learned of him the approaching birth of Mary, who was to be their queen.

Hitherto the Virgin and our Lord are on the square, each of their births annunciated by an angel. Her conception, in the next place, was alike miraculous; for (besides that Joachim and Ann were both of them past the age of having children) it was immaculate, *i. e.* Mary also, as well as Jesus, was conceived without original sin. The Church knew nothing of this mystery for eleven or twelve hundred years, when certain lazy canons of Lyons set themselves to invent this fancy, whom St. Bernard* laboured to confound, but without any great success. The devotion to the Virgin daily increasing, it was found very convenient she should be exempted from the law, common to all the children of Adam. It is true indeed, that all the Fathers, St. Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Remigius, and the rest, were of another opinion, as Melchior Canus, the learned bishop of the Canaries, proves from their citations:

* Ep. 74. ad Can. Lugd.

but we are to appeal, it seems, from them, as incompetent judges in this case, though their authority be very good in any other. The Jesuit Salmeron* does all he can to invalidate their testimony and authority. He says, that proofs drawn from authority are not altogether sure; that the greatest part of Fathers cited against the immaculate conception deserve not to be heard; and that at last, however, God had not revealed all things to all men; that the Fathers were ignorant of this great truth, the revelation of which was reserved for these latter ages of the world.

This is no place to give you an account of the terrible bickerings there have been upon this score for many ages, and even in this of ours, between the Jacobins and Cordeliers, *i. e.* Dominicans and Franciscans; the former maintaining, with Thomas Aquinas, that the Virgin was conceived in original sin; the latter, with Scotus, that she was conceived without it. And although the Popes have never formally and in express words decreed it to be an article of faith, yet they have defined it as a truth, which no man can oppose without great rashness. And it has been forbid to the Dominicans to preach, deliver their opinion, or teach in public or private, directly or indirectly, any thing against the immaculate conception of the Virgin, since which the worship of her has exceedingly increased; every body almost hath chosen her for their patroness, and whole kingdoms have put themselves into her protection.

Nor is this a place to refute this extravagance in, although it very well deserves to be refuted, since it smells strongly of profaneness, in that it deprives our Saviour of the honour and advantage of having been the only one that was conceived without sin; and of being the Redeemer of the world without exception. For if the blessed Virgin was without both actual and original sin, I do not see how she stood in need of either remission or redemption, and she contributed nothing to herself, or to her own salvation, by bringing Jesus Christ into the world.

We must not here forget that Papism, agreeable to the spirit of error by which it stands, has not failed to heap fable upon fable, and to establish this immaculate conception, by many a lying miracle and many a false vision. St. Bridget has defined this controversy many a time and oft, and the Virgin Mother has revealed it to her frequently, that she was conceived with-

* In Ep. ad Roman. cap. 5. Disput. 51.

out original sin, and many miracles have been wrought to that purpose. But that which is as pretty is, that the Dominicans* have also had their saint and prophetess, to maintain she was conceived in original sin, and that was Catharine of Sienna, whose revelation is upheld by Cardinal Cajetan,† as much more creditable than that of Bridget; for that Catharine had been canonized in due and formal manner when there was a lawful Pope, and so acknowledged over all the world, whereas Bridget was canonized by Benedict IX.‡ in a time of schism, when nobody knew who was the true Pope, or whether there was any such at all.

The Dominicans,§ not contented with St. Catharine's revelation, would also have some miracles to establish their opinion on; and I believe there are few in the world that have not heard of the famous history of the Dominicans of Berne (and here in England, by the name of the history of Jetzer), who took upon them to prove by miracles, the conception of the Virgin to have been in sin, against the Cordeliers. Four of these men undertook to deceive and cheat a wretched simple novice of their convent; and one of them appeared to him like a spirit, telling him, that the order of Dominicans was most unjustly hated, because it taught, after St. Thomas, that the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin; but that their enemies, the Franciscans, were sufficiently tormented in purgatory, and especially among the rest Alexander of Hales, and John Duns Scotus, for teaching the contrary: the Virgin Mary herself in like manner appeared to him (that is to say, a friar in her habit), and imprinted on his right hand (by way of vision) one of the wounds of our Lord her son, which the monk (without a vision) did really and indeed feel, to his very great pain; and very well he might, for the Virgin-monk had pierced his hand through with a great nail. But in wounding him, she gave him some lint and rags made of our Saviour's swaddling-bands whilst they abode in Egypt, and assured him from her own self that she was born in original sin. But the monks, not satisfied with this, gave to our young novice (who was indeed a very stupid blockhead) a mighty strong sleeping potion, which deprived him of all manner of sense and understanding, and in this fit imprinted other four wounds upon his feet, his hand, and side, with aqua fortis, to imitate the

* 5 Book Rev. the 13. and Book 6. cap. 49.

† Tom. 2. Opusc. Tract. 31. c. 5.

‡ Pius II.

§ 1507.

wounds of our Saviour and the marks of St. Francis. Being come to himself, they made him believe he had been in an ecstacy, during which the blessed Spirit had imprinted on him these four new wounds. They gave him also very frequently strange drinks to make him foam and struggle against death, as Jesus Christ had done before him. Hitherto the poor wretch had never doubted of the truth of all this, but believed in good earnest that he had had true visions from heaven and apparitions of the Virgin; but now at last began to suspect there must be some enchantments, witchcraft, and illusion in the case; and therefore (after he had been thus martyred several months) makes his escape from the convent to the magistrates, where he discovered all the mystery. Langius, a monk, in his chronicle in the year 1509, adds, that they made an image of the Virgin, and filled the head of it with some red liquor, which distilling from the eyes, she was reputed thereby to weep blood. They coloured also an host with vermilion and flesh-colour, as though it had been turned into flesh; and all this to persuade the world their doctrine of the conception was true. Four of the Dominicans were hereupon seized; Francis Vulchi, that counterfeited the spirit; Stephen Boltzhorst, preacher, whose office was to vend these visions in the pulpit, with J. Vetter, prior of the house; and H. Steniekcr, receiver, who were all burnt over against the convent in the year aforesaid. This story did not serve a little towards the disabusing of the Switzers some time after, when they reformed themselves in matters of religion.

The monks, to whom heaven in these latter days revealed the notable circumstance of the immaculate conception, have also, by the same spirit of revelation, learnt the very day when it was. It was on the eighth of December,* and she was brought forth the eighth of September following; this we know,* because we know what age the Virgin was of when she lay-in of our Saviour; and knowing precisely the year of our Lord, we know also the year of his mother's birth: not that the Gospel says a letter of her age, but that's all one. We have found it in Niccphorus Callistus,† an author that may compare with any legendary in the world, and who, by consequence, shall have as much credit as a true evangelist. We have found, I say, in this historian, that the Virgin was just fifteen when she brought forth Jesus Christ. She was born at

* Her Birth.

† Lib. 2. c. 2. ex Enodo Antiocheno.

Jerusalem, in Joachim's house, that stood pretty near to the pool of Bethesda, of which St. John, in the fifth of his Gospel, makes mention. For so says our old friend, J. Damascene,* who was sainted for having been a martyr for the worship of the Virgin's images. Others (and Tostatus for one, on Matth. ii.) say, she was born at Nazareth, or Seppharo, three leagues from thence; but wherever it was, it is certain that the whole universe was moved at it. The angels (as they did some time after for the Son) descended in troops from heaven, chanting out hymns, and most melodious songs, in honour of the spouse of their eternal King. The little holy maid herself (having the use of her reason as soon as she was born) found also mighty consolation and exceeding great pleasure in it:† and, which is a greater wonder yet, this heavenly melody is every year repeated on the same day. And by this music, the day of her birth, which had long been undiscovered, came to be revealed to a very contemplative saint, who had heard this music every eighth of September, and wondered what the matter was (as a wiser man than he might very well do); and therefore on a time, in one of his rapture-fits, begged of God that he would reveal this matter to him; and was answered, that on this day the glorious Virgin was born; and thus has the mother gotten the start of her Son. She was even with him, in having armies of celestial spirits to celebrate the day of her birth; but this yearly repetition of the angels' harmony has given her the advantage: for I don't know any book that says they do as much for Jesus Christ.

It may be some devotee of the Virgin, jealous of the glory of his queen, may find something less in the birth of Mary than in that of Jesus Christ, because he hears of no new star that accompanied her birth as one did his. But this only serves to betray his want of reading; for had he seen but one Theophilus, a certain historian (of whose age and authority it would be to no purpose to inquire, for nobody can give you an account, but, however, of very good credit in this case), he could have told him, that on the birthday of the Virgin the light of the sun was doubled, that the moon received such an augmentation of light that she seemed almost to equalize the sun, so that the little cloud that is wont to obscure her, disappeared on the night of this nativity, and round her globe shone, as it were, a great star, of an extraordinary fire and lustre.

* L. 4. c. 5. de Orth. fide, et Orat. 1. de Nat. Virg.

† Peibart. Stellarium, lib. 5. part. 1. art. 3.

I think this was another kind of star than that which appeared to the Wise Men in the East, which seemed to be but a pitiful flying meteor in the air in comparison with this. An angel gave the name of Jesus before the child was born, and an angel did as much for her, and the name of Mary was of Heaven's choice; and it was also mystical as well as that of Jesus; for Mary, or Miriam, in the Hebrew, signifies the Star of the Sea. Not that any Jew or Rabbi, how profound soever, ever understood this etymology, but that it was revealed to our legendaries so to signify, that by virtue of it she might succeed to Venus, who was the morning star before, and president of the sea, having a kind of right thereto by her extraction from the froth of it: for as Salmeron* the Jesuit says, as the star that is called Hesperus and Lucifer, directs and conducts the sailors to the port, so the mother of Messiah succours us in all our dangers, that we may arrive at the port of the grace of God and life eternal. Common seamen have another kind of opinion of her power, in respect of ports and havens, in this world too.

After the birth,† next comes her education in her tenderest years; the Scriptures say nothing of this neither, but we have lost nothing by that; for we learn elsewhere, that Ann, to obtain her of God, had, as Hannah had heretofore done for Samuel, vowed her to his service: and that when she was weaned and three years old, she was presented to the high-priest, who received her as a precious jewel, and lodged her in the *sanctum sanctorum*, where before stood the ark of the covenant, and where he himself alone had right to enter once a year. Zachary, the father of St. John Baptist, was, it seems, high-priest, and made no such unnecessary scruples as these: How should I introduce a little girl into a place where I myself can enter in but once a year? How can I, in the most sacred and august partition of the temple, bring in a bed, a nurse, and little child, with all that's necessary in such a case? And what shall become of all the impurities inseparable from the infant age? But being a prophet, and knowing the mystery of all, he received her without any stickling. Thither she was brought, accompanied with troops of virgins, with flaming torches in their hands, and there was brought up for eleven years, the angels all the while supplying her with nourishment.

* Tome 3. Tract. 4.

† Niceph. l. 1. cap. 7. Damasc. ubi supra Cermanes Const. in Encomio B. Virginis.

After eleven years the priests assembled to consult what they should do with this Divine Virgin, and at last concluded to commit her to the guardianship of St. Joseph, of whose virtue and continence they were very well assured; eleven and three make fourteen; and at fourteen she was affianced to Joseph; three months after the angel came with the salutation, she conceived of the Holy Ghost, and was brought to bed at fifteen.

An unbelieving Jew would make a great many odd exceptions to this history; he would say it was a thing unheard of in the mystery of religion, to introduce, to feed and bring up a girl in the Holy of Holies, where ordinary priests themselves durst never enter. He would tell us that women, were they never so pure, were never admitted into the temple beyond the place called the Women's Court. He would say, it was very strange the rabbins and ancient doctors should mention no such thing as this, either to recount or refute it. He would add, moreover, that in the catalogue of high-priests he could find no such man as Zachary, the father of John Baptist.* Indeed, these difficulties have put our Catholic doctors to no small trouble; and now they rather choose to say, that round the sanctuary there were little chambers, where recluses and religious maids were bred up, and worked for the temple, to whose care the education of little Mary was intrusted: but our old devout gentlemen heretofore never concerned themselves with any scruples or objections of unbelievers, but in great simplicity swallowed all for truth, upon the word and authority of saints, such as J. Damascene canonized, and consequently made infallible, at least by the tacit consent of the Church. And who can forbear believing a history that has gotten some twelve hundred years upon his head; for Gregory Nyssen † reports this; and though he reports it only as an apocryphal history, yet the Church has since made it as good as canonical, by an universal belief of it.

The blessed Virgin consented to live with Joseph in show of marriage, but in effect in pure virginity, for she told him secretly that she had made a vow of chastity, and withal advised him to do so too. But notwithstanding her vow, which seemed to determine her never to become a mother, she quickly after became so by the operation of the Holy Ghost. And here

* Costerus Medit. 3. de præsent. Virg.

† In Natalib. Chr. tom. 3. [p. 345, &c. Par. 1638]

the doctors are in great trouble to know of what it was the Virgin conceived, and formed the Saviour of the world. Some believe the Holy Ghost took three drops of her heart's blood, and disposed them in their place to make the body of our Lord. Salmeron,* though he reject this opinion, yet allows it to be a devout religious contemplation. But he himself is of another mind, which I cannot give you in his terms, no more than I can the opinions of other authors upon this occasion, because they search into the mysteries of generation so profoundly and exactly, and examine them in such a gross and naked manner, that even the chastest and most delicate translation of their Latin into English would not fail to wound, or at least disorder our imagination. It would be worse yet, if I should recite any thing out of a book that was current in the last age (and, it may be, is in being now), entitled, *Proto-Enangelium, sive de Natalibus Christi, et ipsius Matris V. Mariæ*, and fathered on St. James. Here we may find enough to make the most shameless prostitutes to blush, upon occasion of one Salome a midwife, who would not believe a virgin had brought forth, but would needs be as curious in her way as St. Thomas, doubting of the resurrection, was afterwards in his. One William Postell, in the preceding age, made the discovery of this horrible gospel, God knows whence. But is it not a pretty ready way to bring the true and sacred Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ into contempt?

I will pass over all the impertinent tales with which they charge the life of the blessed Virgin. The care she took to keep the foreskin of our Lord at his circumcision; the pains she was at to gather all the blood and water that fell from his hands, and feet, and side, upon the cross; and in particular, the care she had to keep the nails that fastened him thereto. I will pass over all this, I say, and a hundred such-like things, to come to the last and greatest action of all, her assumption into heaven, because it is one of the principal stories on which the worship of the blessed Virgin is established. Thus, then, the gentlemen report the matter.

The blessed Virgin † lived upon the earth after her Son till she was fifty-eight years old, as some say; sixty-three, as others; and others more by a great deal. At last she prayed very earnestly to her Son, that she might depart from this place

* Tome 3. Tract. 9.

† Felbart, who lived in the year 1471, and dedicated his book to Pope Sixtus IV.

of pilgrimage on earth, and be gathered unto him ; who thereupon sent an angel to her, promising that within three days he would take her to himself. Together with this news, the angel delivered her a branch of palm that he brought from Paradise, and told her she must have it carried before her bier to her interment : he gave her also a suit of mourning which her Son had sent her. Of this angel she demanded two things : first, that she might be buried by all the Apostles ; secondly, that when her soul departed from her body it might meet with none of the devils or malign spirits. Upon which last demand the angel said unto her, " Madam, why are you afraid to meet the devil, whose head it is that you have bruised ? However, what you ask you shall have : you shall meet with no devils, and the noble Apostles shall inter you." Upon this the angel reascended into heaven, environed with a great light. And suddenly the branch of palm that he had brought, and left in the Virgin's hand, became exceeding bright, of a lively shining green, and every leaf thereof as glorious as the morning star.

To free you from all manner of doubt in this matter, St. Cosmos Vestitor (from whom this honest Pelbart says he took this history) tells us, he saw himself a little piece of this branch, which retained to his days a lustre equal to a very bright star.

The Virgin, full of joy at this good news, assembled all the virgins and saints together, and gave them to understand her death was now at hand, comforting them thereupon. At the same time was St. John the Apostle preaching at Ephesus, and in the middle of his sermon comes me a clap of thunder and a white cloud, that whisked him through the air, and set him down at the door of the Virgin Mary's house ; where being entered, he and the Virgin embraced each other with abundance of tears, and Mary recommended to his care her burial. At which words the good Apostle threw himself down upon the earth, and with a great deal of passion cried out and said, " Alas ! my God, my God, why dost thou lay this sore affliction upon us, to take away this holy mistress of our religion, the mirror of sanctity, and our only consolation ?" As he was thus lamenting, the blessed Virgin shewed him the shining palm and the mourning suit her Son had sent her, and ordered him to take great care this branch were carried before her bier. St. John desired with all his heart that all the Apostles might accompany him at this solemn action ; and im-

mediately the Apostles, that were scattered in all the corners of the earth, were carried through the air on white clouds, and set down before the house, where entering in, and meeting with St. John, they were marvellously astonished ; but after salutations, he explained the whole mystery to them, upon hearing of which they were overwhelmed with grief ; and entering into Mary's room, adored her in the angel's salutation, saying "*Ave Maria, gratia plena,*" &c. to whom the Virgin replied, saying, " God preserve you, the chosen disciples of my only Son." After a great deal of homage and adoration paid unto her by the Apostles, she received the communion, recommended her spirit to her Son, kneeled down upon the ground, lifted up her soul to God, and disposed herself to give up the ghost. About the third hour of the night Jesus himself, with the nine orders of angels, the assembly of patriarchs, prophets, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, came down from heaven, and stood about her bed, the whole celestial army singing songs and admirable hymns to the honour of Mary, Jesus himself beginning, and saying, " Come, my chosen, come, and I will place thee on my throne." To whom the Virgin answered, " Lo, I come, as it is written in the volume of the book, that I should do thy will, O my God ;" and thereupon rendered up her soul into the hands of her Son, who bore it away with him to heaven. When the soul was gone, the body made shift of itself to say, " I give thee thanks, O Lord, for that I am thy glory ; remember me, because I am the work of thy hands, and have kept what you committed to my charge ;" upon which the body became so luminous, that the maids who were preparing it for burial, and could touch it very well before, could not so much as look upon it. Now, when all things were ready, and the body ready to be taken up, the Apostles made abundance of compliments and ceremonies, offering the places of honour to one another round with great civility ; but at last it was agreed that Peter and Paul should carry the corpse, John should go before with the palm, and the rest of the Apostles should follow in couples. As they were going forward, Jesus Christ marched over them with all his angels, covered in a cloud, and joining voices with the college of Apostles, they made an admirable consort ; and at the same time a most sweet and fragrant odour was spread through all the region of the air on all hands.

The Jews, at this sight, being filled with rage and malice, thought this a very fair opportunity to rid their hands at once

of all the Apostles of Jesus Christ there met together; and gathering together, the high-priest himself advances first, and most profanely lays his two hands upon the bier to stop them; when lo! immediately they both withered, and were torn off at the elbows, and there hung on each side of the corpse, whilst the rest that followed him were struck with blindness. The miserable high-priest made a lamentable howling for the loss of his hands, and for extreme anguish that he felt. But Peter told him honestly, there was no way to save himself but by kissing the bier where the body of Mary lay, and making profession of the Christian faith, which he quickly did, and both his hands were immediately fastened on again. A little after Peter gave him one of the dates that grew on the branch of palm, to rub his followers' eyes with, who thereupon recovered their sight. And now, without any further molestation, they were come to the vale of Jehoshaphat, where they found a sepulchre hewn out of a rock, and altogether like that of Jesus Christ; there they laid the body of the Virgin, and continued three days in their devotions at her tomb. At the end of which a bright cloud shone all about the sepulchre, the voices of angels echoed out from every quarter, a sweet smelling savour was spread throughout the air, and all the world was seized with ravishing astonishment. Jesus descended with his angels, and having saluted his Apostles, said unto them, "What glory, and what honour, think you, ought I to bestow upon my mother?" To which, with one consent, they answered, "It seemeth just unto thy servants, O Lord, that as thou hast vanquished death, and reignest from generation to generation, so also thou shouldst raise the body of thy mother, and set her at thy right hand for evermore." The soul of Mary presently appeared, and our Lord said to it, "Arise, my well-beloved, the tabernacle of glory, thou art fair, my dearly beloved, and there is no blemish in thee; as thou hast no spot, so shall thy body never see corruption."

And thus were things carried, according to the report of Pelbart of Temeswaer, a grave author, whom Father Crasset,* a Jesuit, hath very lately cited abundance of times (in his book of True Devotion to the Virgin, printed in 1679), as worthy thoroughly to be believed; and Pelbart himself tells us, he had them from the writings of St. Cosmus Vestitor. Others report these matters a little otherwise, in the business

* 1 Part. tr. 1. quest. 13. p. 103. [Par. 1679.]

of the Virgin's tomb, which, they say, stood open three days, by reason St. Thomas was absent, who earnestly desired (it would not be very fair to ask of whom he desired this, or how he came to know she was dead, but desire he did) the consolation of seeing the body of Mary ; which yet was not granted him, for he came, and found the sepulchre was empty, and in the midst of it a spring of manna boiling up.

O God ! what face is this, to forge so silly a romance, for which there is not in good history the least foundation ? For, in a word, in all this rhapsody there is not a syllable of truth : and yet this is the bottom of the worship and adoration paid to the blessed Virgin, and of the feast of her Assumption.

It is not my business to confute this story of the Assumption here ; let it suffice at present that I advertise you, it was unknown to all the ancients for the first four ages. That passage in the Chronicle of Eusebius, is acknowledged by men of understanding to be false and spurious ; as likewise are the pieces attributed to St. Austin and St. Jerome ; together with the false Dionysius, who wrote between four and five hundred at the soonest. In a word, the men of sense and honesty, even amongst the Romanists, do at this day look upon the Assumption as an idle business, but I must not tell the people so. The Church of Paris seems to have declared openly against it ; for by an ordinance of the cathedral chapter, of Notre Dame, the first of August, 1668, it was decreed that such a certain long sermon or homily that had been read in the choir the first canonical hour for many years last past, on the fifteenth of August, the feast of the Assumption every year, should be read no more. (This sermon, you must know, established the Assumption both of body and soul, and was added by I cannot tell who, from the year 1549, or 1550,) and that henceforwards should be read what was usually read out of the Martyrology, taken from Uswardus.

Now the passage in Uswardus,* which the chapter and bishop of Paris ordered to be restored to its place, has these words : "The sleep or death of Mary, the holy mother of God." "Although her sacred body is not found on earth, yet the Church, who is a pious mother, celebrates her blessed memory, not doubting in the least but that she died according to the condition of all mankind. But the Church being deliberate in her judgments, hath rather chosen to own she knows not where this

* Who lived in the 9th Cent.

sacred temple of the Holy Ghost is hidden by the providence of God, than teach anything herein either vain or apocryphal." These were the words that were taken from the service of the feast of the Assumption, to thrust in a certain sermon that taught just contrary; saying, the Church looked upon the Assumption of the blessed Virgin's body and soul into heaven as a thing very sure and certain. Claudius Joly,* canon of the Church, and one of the commissaries deputed to examine this affair, hath made a dissertation thereupon. And the learned Monsieur de Launoy† has given his judgment on the same subject, in whose works one may find enough to confound this story of the Assumption, and answer Baronius and the rest, who look upon it as a point of faith, or at least a sacred history, that no body must touch, or offer once to disbelieve.

What we have hitherto seen of the history of the blessed Virgin, and on which the worship that is paid to her is founded, is but a little part of the Chronicle of the Mother of God. She has done more miracles since her death, than Jesus Christ and all his Apostles did in all their lives in all the world; and we have huge great volumes of them, some of which I cannot forbear giving you for a taste, because the worship of the blessed Virgin is exceedingly built and established on them, and because they are at this day thought the efficacious and powerful arguments to defend their superstition. And F. Crasset, a Jesuit of repute, thought so to be sure, when in answer to the author of *Sober Advice to the indiscreet devotees of the Virgin*—he makes this use of them.

In the number of these fables, I put the establishment of places and devotion, where the Virgin is particularly worshipped, where she works great miracles, and whither her devotees go on pilgrimage; the reputation, I say, of these places, and their holiness, is founded on such fables, as I verily believe Pagans would blush to own. Such, for example, is that on which is founded the famous worship of our Lady of Mount Serrat. We are told, the first Count of Barcelona had an exceeding handsome daughter, but possessed with a devil, whom the Count one day carried to a holy man in the neighbourhood, called friar John Guerin, to the end he should exorcise the devil, and deliver his daughter: he did so, and for fear the devil should return again into her, he advised the Count to

* C. Joly de Verbis Usuardi dissertatio.

† J. Launoi de Controversia super exscribendo Martyrologio.

leave her there some little time in his keeping; to which the Count consented, and accordingly left her. Friar John being alone with this handsome young lady (and not being able to quell his own devil), became enamoured of her; and in short, ravished her first, and afterwards killed her, at the instigation of a devil disguised like a hermit. After this, being guilty of these detestable crimes, away he goes to Rome, there confesses himself to the Pope, who ordered him for penance, to return to Mount Serrat upon all four, like a beast as he was; and not to speak a word, nor offer to get upon his legs till a child about three months old should bid him rise, and tell him God had pardoned his offence. Seven years after this the Count of Barcelona was a hunting, when some of his men found out this friar in a den, all over hairy like a bear, whom they took and chained, and brought away with them to the castle of Barcelona, where he was tied up in the stable like a monster. The Count a little after made a great feast, and to divert his company, ordered the monster to be brought forth; whom as soon as the earl's child saw, that was there in its nurse's arms, it said distinctly these words: "Rise up upon thy feet, Friar John Guerin, for God hath pardoned thy offence." And immediately the friar came to himself, began to speak, and tell the whole story. Upon which the Count told him, that since God had pardoned him, he could do no less. But, however, he desired to know where he had buried his daughter, that he might take up her bones, and bury them in his father's sepulchre. The good friar conducted the Count's servants to the place where he had interred the lady, and opening the ground, they found her (would you think it?) alive and well, as fresh and as handsome as ever, excepting a little kind of streak like a scarlet thread about her neck in the place where he had cut. The maid spoke, and told them she owed her life to the blessed Virgin, to whom she had been consecrated, and who preserved her (and indeed it was so) miraculously. There they built a convent, of which this young lady was the Abbess, and Friar John Guerin, the confessor. Near to this place,* in a certain grotto, was found an image of the blessed Virgin, exceeding bright and luminous, and perfumed with excellent sweets, which was discovered by angels' melody, that were worshipping it in the cave; this image, they that found it were for carrying away; but when they came as far as the

* Ferreolus Locrius, lib. 4. c. 25. *Marie Augustæ.*

place where the lady had been buried, it grew so heavy on their hands, that they were glad to leave it there with all their hearts. There they built a chapel over it, although it was a very desert place, and mighty inconvenient for the pilgrims resorting thither; and this is the rise of that famous chapel, where so many miracles and famous things have been done.

The devotion of our Lady of Liesse, is founded on a tale no less ridiculous than the former, though it be something less horrible. We are told that a certain princess, daughter to the Soldan of Egypt, in the time of the holy wars (the original of all romances), came to visit three gentlemen of Picardy, that were prisoners at Grand Cairo, and demanded of them the picture of the blessed Virgin. Not a man of them understood a bit of painting, but however one of them promised her highness what she required; but being put very hard to fulfil it, the Virgin delivered them from their concern, by giving them her picture from heaven herself. The princess, upon this, found means to break their prison and escape with them, and passing an arm of the sea, they laid them down to sleep in a wood, and waking in the morning, found themselves in Picardy by a fountain, where they built the church of our Lady of Liesse.

But of this kind there is nothing in the world more renowned, and at the same time more absurd, than the history of the famous chamber of our Lady of Loretto. This is the very chamber of the house of Joachim and Ann, in the city of Nazareth in Galilee, in which the Virgin Mary was born. (Our legendaries should consult with one another sometimes, for before we heard she was born in Jerusalem with a great deal of punctuality.) In this chamber she received the salutation of the angel, in this conceived the Saviour of the world, and in this bred him up till he was twelve years of age. The Apostles, after the death of Jesus Christ, observing carefully what a world of miracles were wrought in this chamber, judged it very convenient to build a chapel there, and celebrate the mysteries in it, that is to say, to sing mass in it; and St. Luke the Evangelist, who was as good a painter as physician, drew with his own hand the picture of the Virgin, which is there to be seen to this day. This chapel was frequented with a great deal of devotion whilst the Christians staid in Galilee, and especially in the time of the crusades, or holy wars; but the Christians being chased away, and the devotion at this chamber beginning to cool apace, the angels took it on the 9th of

May, in the year 1291 (says Tursellin, very exactly), and brought it through the air into Dalmatia, distant from Galilee about six thousand miles ; as those who have cast it up tell us, upon whom let it rest. There the angels set the chamber or chapel down upon a hill, in view of the Adriatic sea, between two towns, the one called Tersactum, and the other Flumen. At the first there was a mighty concourse of devout people that came upon the fame of this great miracle, but their zeal continued not ; and the Virgin not finding there the honour she expected, ordered the angels a second time to take the room, and passing the Adriatic sea, to transport it into Italy, and set it down in the territory of Recanati, in the midst of a wood belonging to a certain lady (for without a woman in the case there can be no great miracle) called Loretta, that owned the diocese or territory of Recanati, which accordingly they did. This new miracle of the second transportation of the chamber, rekindled men's devotion for the Virgin, and there was old flocking to it from all quarters ; but the situation of the chapel was an occasion of a great many robberies and villanies committed on the poor pilgrims, by reason that the woods afforded shelter to the rogues, who upon all occasions sallied out upon them, and retired into the same securely. The angels therefore thought it fit it should be taken from amidst this wood, and removed a little farther to a mountain that belonged to two brothers, which brothers in a short time made a very profitable business of it by the great resort of pilgrims, and the rich presents that were made ; but not being able to agree in the division of the spoil, the Virgin was very angry, and thought they were unworthy of the honour she had done them, and therefore ordered the angels to transfer it to another place ; up then they took it the fourth time and set it in the highway, where now it stands and works such miracles. The people of Recanati came to see this miraculous room, and finding it set upon the ground without any manner of foundation, were greatly afraid it would fall down, and therefore built about it a huge thick and mighty wall, which stands at this present to be seen. But nobody could tell from whence this house came till a long time after, when the blessed Virgin appeared in a dream to a certain man, an intimate friend and servant of hers, and revealed the whole matter to him as I have been relating it. This man declared the same to a certain wise and understanding person of that country, who thought it convenient to depute sixteen grave and creditable men to go to Nazareth in

Galilee, and take cognizance of the matter of fact. Away they went, taking the measure of the house at Loretto with them, and came safe to Nazareth, where they found an empty space where the Virgin's house had stood, and nothing left but the foundations, of which these sixteen took the length and breadth, and finding them to agree most exactly with the dimensions of Loretto-house, they were sufficiently convinced; but besides, they found an inscription on the wall hard by, attesting that such a church had stood there heretofore, and was miraculously carried away. And thus this truth was laid open as manifest as the light by the testimony of almost a jury and a half of able ambassadors; and this we find written in the registers of that house, and hung up in a table in the chapel, to be seen by all comers. This is in effect an epitome of Tursellin's great history of this house,* who amplifies the matter very curiously. This Jesuit's book was printed with privilege from Pope Clement VIII., with the general approbation of the greatest doctors at Rome, such as Raynaud, Bzovius, Spondanus, and others, who refer us to this book as a piece that is able to ease us of all manner of doubts, that may rise on this occasion.

And will the time then never come, when men will re-assume that shame they have so long renounced? How is it possible they can in earnest propagate such impertinences as this? *Cui bono*, To what end and purpose is it that a house must jump from place to place thus through the air? Who does not see that this is an invention of one who is not the father of truth, to uphold those lamentable superstitions, of which that blessed maid is made the object?

It may be convenient here to observe, that this pretended transportation is said to have been made at the end of the thirteenth century, when the Saracens had entirely chased the Christians out of Palestine: and yet St. Antonine, archbishop of Florence, one of the hardiest relators, and greatest admirers of fabulous miracles and strange things that perhaps the world ever had, says not one word of this matter; and yet he should have known, being an Italian and living within one hundred and fifty years of the time appointed for this great wonder, and one that would have believed it if he had but once heard of it. Another saint also of the same order, (a Dominican) and same country, to wit, Vincent Ferrier, that lived, according to Bel-

* Tursellin's *Historiæ Lauretanæ*, lib. 1.

larmine's account, 1410, or as others say, in 1440, in a sermon (amongst his works) on the Feast of the Assumption, says expressly, that our lady's chamber is still at Nazareth, and yet according to the history, it had been then in Italy above one hundred years ; and was it not possible that great saint should not know as much ? But thus it is, the fable was at first invented without any conscience, without any shame, or indeed, without any discretion ; God so permitting it, for the further evidencing this great truth, that we might more easily see on what grounds all this kind of worship is founded. But now for a sample or two of miracles.

We are not to doubt, but as she is the most glorious, she is also the most holy, and by consequence, the humblest of all women ; but Papism has made her a very pattern of pride and ambition, always aiming at divine honours ; angry with all that pay them not, severely punishing those that offend her, and recompensing amply all that are peculiarly devoted to her, and working miracles perpetually for nothing but to acquire adoration and honour to herself. To establish this adoration they have made such a romance of the blessed Virgin, that no good sober heathen would have done the like to his Minerva or Diana, goddesses of chastity.

For example : what more could any servant of Venus or of Flora, goddesses of prostitution, say of their deities, than has been said of Mary, when they make her to marry St. Dominic ? This saint was in a cavern, where he was doing penances, alas ! for the Albigenses of Thoulouse, covered with gore and wounds of his own inflicting. To him the Virgin appeared, accompanied with three women, each of them being attended with fifty other women ; these were (oh horror to relate !) the three Persons of the Holy Trinity,* that made up the nuptial equipage and pomp, when the Virgin was to marry Dominic ; and coming to him, "Dominic," said she, "my son, my dear husband, because thou hast valiantly fought against the enemies of the faith, lo, I am come to succour thee, I, (I say) whom thou so oft hast called upon." Then the three queens that accompanied her lift up St. Dominic from the ground, where he lay half dead, and the Virgin received him into her embraces, kissing him lovingly and tenderly, and withal opened her breasts and let him suck till he was perfectly recovered. In what a hot and furious imagination was the impudent monk, think you, when he wrote these horrible things ? Came he

* Alanus Redivivus, p. 2. c. 3.

not reeking from his damned debauches, to commit these foul impurities to paper? I appeal to all persons in the Roman communion, of pious minds and chaste thoughts, nay, to all the adorers of the blessed Virgin, that have any sense of virtue, any touch of shame, to all such I appeal for my just indignation against this. Alanus de Rupibus (for he it is that reports these things, and that writes of the like abominable intercourse betwixt the Virgin and himself), says, "he was usually tempted of the devil once in every seven years, and in one of these fits,* he had like to have cut his own throat for despair; but at midnight the Virgin came into his cell, and after a great deal of discourse, drew out her breasts and milked them on the wounds the devil had made, and cured them perfectly. Afterwards she married her servant in the presence of Jesus Christ, and a great many saints there present, giving him her virgin-ring, made of her virgin-hair. After this she put about his neck a chain or string, made likewise of her hair, with a hundred and fifty precious stones, according to the number of beads in the Virgin's psalter or chaplet. After she gave him a sweet kiss, and let him suck her virgin breasts, which he doing very greedily, seemed to have all his body bedewed with a sweet liquor; and this favour," he says, "she afforded him frequently." Another story tells us, that one Eustochium, a religious nun, having begged of the Virgin to see the child Jesus, she found him laid upon the straw, where she fell to kissing and embracing him so ardently, that she thought she should have died for pleasure on the place. Another young maid about fourteen, a devout servant of the Virgin's, having asked the same thing, Mary gave him into her arms, who embraced, caressed, and kissed him with such violent transports of love, that her very heart was cleft asunder. Fair warning, one would think, to young maids?

Has either Alcoran or Jewish Talmud stories so lewd and so abominable as these? Yet these are the authors whose authority F. Crasset has within these six last years renewed and re-established in his book! But what is the design of these tales? Why, it is to establish the worship of the blessed Virgin; for St. Dominic had never been her husband, but that he invented the rosary, otherwise called the Virgin's Psalter, composed of a hundred and fifty beads, of which there are fifteen *pater-nosters* for God (and well they can

* Idem. *ibid.* part 2. c. 4.

spare them too), and one hundred and thirty-five *Ave Maria's* for the Virgin. And for the same reason was our friend Alan favoured, because the rosary-way of worship beginning to decay, he did what in him lay to revive it. And for the two virgins obtaining the favour to kiss Jesus Christ in the flesh, even to swooning away, why was it, but because they were devoted to the service of the Virgin in a more peculiar manner? Now, that you may not think these fearful examples are but few in number, you must know there are abundance of them in all the authors that F. Crasset quotes and admires. Hautin, a Jesuit like himself, reports a history from Surius of the marriage of the Virgin Mary with one Herman, surnamed Joseph (because they were both of them married to the Virgin), to whom the Virgin came, accompanied with two angels, one of which began to speak and say, "To whom shall we marry this young man?"—"To Mary," replied the other; at which they commanded Herman to draw near: poor Herman knew not what in the earth to do; love pricked him on, and shamefacedness pulled him back;* for though before-times he had particular intimacy with the blessed Virgin, yet he could never hope to see himself advanced to such a degree as to be married to her. Cæsarius also,† whom F. Crasset quotes as a very sincere author, relates the story of a soldier that fell in love with his captain's wife, and following the advice of a good hermit, saluted the Virgin a hundred times a day, who, to recompense this civility, offered herself to him like an exceeding handsome woman, saying, "I will be thy wife, come and kiss me," and forced him to it. In the same author we find the Virgin Mary kissing and embracing monks very liberally: some she watches over whilst they sleep; others she wipes the face of whilst they sleep with her handkerchief. And had I not reason to say the Chronicles of Diana and Minerva were more chastely delivered down than those of the ever-blessed Mother of our Lord?

After these favours it would be vain to produce any more or others; but you may be assured there is no sort nor kind with which the devotees to the Virgin have not some time or other been graced. She has kept them in their sicknesses; she has given them their sight; she has delivered them from extreme dangers both by sea and land, from thieves and

* Hautin *Angelus Custos*, c. 4. numb. 3.

† Cæsarius, l. 7. c. 13, 18, 32, 52.

fire, from the gibbet, from prisons and from death itself; for many have been raised from the dead, only because they or their parents have been religious worshippers of the blessed Virgin. Read but *Chronicon S. V. Deiparæ*, where you shall find a thousand instances. If one should collect together all the deliverances God hath wrought from the beginning of the world to this day, they would not make a history to compare with those wrought by our lady of Loretto, Mont Serrat, Liesse, Hall, Moyenpont, Aspremont, Ardiliers, and a hundred more, and all to persuade us that the Virgin is mightily pleased to see herself adored, and that she is at a stand sometimes to find out what favours to bestow on her peculiar servants.

But that which is most abominable is, that these fables would persuade us that the service of the Virgin is of greater benefit to us than that of God; and that, provided a man dedicate himself to her service, let him be otherwise never so wicked a villain, yet he need not despair of his salvation. It was one of these profane visions St. Bridget pretended to have had, and which F. Crasset hath mustered up afresh, to the intent you should not think those opinions were at all altered since those days, 1370. "Sinners," says he,* "being her subjects, make up her crown and glory, and it is for that she loves them with the tenderness and sweet compassion of a mother, let them be never so wicked, as a mother pitieth her children, though they have lost their senses, and are become mad;" and this is what she has revealed to St. Bridget.† "Know thou (quoth the mother to the daughter), my dearest child, that there is no man in the world so lewd and cursed of God, that is entirely forsaken of him whilst he lives; no sinner so desperate, but may return, and find mercy with him, provided he have recourse to me." St. Bonaventure is of the same mind, and expresseth himself in these comfortable words: "O Mary, be a man never so miserable a sinner, you have the soft compassions of a mother for him; you embrace him, and hug him close in your bosom, and never will forsake him, till you have reconciled him to his formidable judge."

It is with design of persuading us to believe these comfortable truths, that F. Crasset musters up a whole chapter of examples of the wickedest men that possibly can be, that yet

* Part I. tr. l. qu. 10. p. 77.

† Brig. Revel. book 6. c. 10.

have been saved, by preserving their devotion for the blessed Virgin,* amidst all their impieties, entire. Such a one is that of Theophilus of Adanus, a city of Cilicia, who having been deposed of his archdeaconry, for no great good, gave himself over to the devil for spite and anger, by the help and means of a Jewish magician whom he served. He renounced Mary and her Son, and gave the devil a scroll signed with his own hand ; after which he became intolerably desperate and mad for what he had done : but in these agonies of mind and soul, a glimpse or ray of hope appeared to him, that blessed Mary could deliver him from this evil, and straightways thereupon he goes to her church, and prostrates himself before her image : which failed him not at this time of need, but reconciled him to God, and forced the devil to give him back his bonds again.

To this F. Crasset† thinks fit to add such another, taken from Cæsarius, of a young Gascoign soldier, who, after he had wasted all he had in the world, gave himself up to Satan, and renounced Jesus Christ ; but do whatever the devil could, he could not be brought to renounce his mother, and this obtained his pardon for that horrible crime ; down he threw himself before the image of the Virgin Mary, which had the image of Jesus in her arms, and heard this dialogue between them. The Virgin's image said, "O my sweet Son, have mercy on this man." The Son's image answered, "Why, mother, what would you have me do with this wretch, that hath renounced me?" After this, the young man saw the blessed Virgin (that is to say, her image) prostrate herself to little Jesus, and demand again his pardon, whom Jesus lovingly took up (and it was very much for a child of his bigness), and said to her, "I never yet refused my mother anything she asked ; I grant it for your sake, and yours alone." Would one believe that a Jesuit should have the confidence to furbish up such ridiculous things as these at this time of day, in such an age as ours ? I have often heard this story told by Protestants, to shame the Papists ; but I never thought it would have been produced at this time by a renowned Jesuit, in honour of their religion, and that too in Paris, the most frequented city in the whole world. But, to put you past all doubting of this truth, F. Crasset tells us that Cæsarius says, that this very Gascoign was alive in his time, 1222, and that nothing was more sure, nor better attested, than this famous

* Ubi supra, p. 86.

† P. 90. part. 1.

story. And for the credit of Cæsarius, the same good father tells us, he was of the order of Cistercians, and lived above four hundred years ago, and was, as Trithemius the abbot* tells us a very learned and a very honest man, and one that stuck to his rule very close. You may judge, says he, of the sincerity and credit of this man, by what he says in his preface to his own works, "God is my witness (cries he) that I am not the inventor of any thing I have reported in my dialogues." And who alive can help believing him after this protestation? Therefore take, in short, another story of Cæsarius's telling, of one Beatrix, a servant in a convent, who being debauched by a priest, got out of the convent, and lived in a bawdy-house fifteen years; during all which time the Virgin Mary took her shape, and constantly supplied her place, so that nobody perceived her absence, and her reputation suffered nothing all the while; and all this, because she had, as she was going out, prayed to the Virgin, and (giving her the keys of the convent into her hand) had said, "Madam,† I have served you as devoutly as possibly I could; I give you here your keys again, and am able no longer to withstand the temptations of the flesh." This tends to the same end with all the rest, namely, to let you understand, that, break God's commands,‡ or do whatever you please, serve but the blessed Virgin, and all is well.

Pelbart of Temeswaer, § another of F. Crasset's great authors, tells us, there was a certain woman that played the whore with a neighbour's husband of hers, whose wife finding his roguery out, prayed to the Virgin to confound that wicked creature that had debauched her husband from her bed; but it was found, that this impudent harlot had still the grace, every day, to say seven Ave Maria's, and therefore the Virgin's image answered the complaining wife, and said, "She of whom thou speakest, offers me praises that are very agreeable to me; and whilst she does so, I assure you, mistress, I can never hurt her, but, on the contrary, will preserve her from disgrace; however, I promise you, I will see and convert her." And this is the way to proselyte to the Virgin, those who trample God's commandments under foot.

If you would have any more stories to prove that the worship of the Virgin, separate from that of God, is a sure way

* P. 105.

† Crass. [ut supra,] p. 90.

‡ Cæsarius, l. 7. c. 35.

§ Stell. Coronæ, l. 12. c. 3.

to salvation, you may find them in great plenty in Father Crasset.* There you may see the Virgin keeping them that keep not God's commands; and how a bird having learned to cry "Ave Maria," and being seized on by a hawk, screamed out but "Ave Maria," and the ravenous hawk immediately left her. And likewise how the devil, being in the air, and spying a Christian that was not upon his guard, came swooping down upon him like a bird of prey; but as soon as he heard him pronounce, and devoutly call upon Mary, he was fain to pull in his horns (I meant his talons) and begone. There you shall see her taking a great deal of pains to raise from the dead rogues that had lived in nothing else but wickedness, and died without repentance, only to give them leisure to confess, and do some trifling penances, and then again depart in peace. It is the same Father Crasset that tells from Surius the history of a citizen of Rome, called Andrew, so insufferably debauched, that he bore no token or mark of Christianity upon him, but that he was an admirer of St. Cæsarion, martyr. As Andrew lived, so he died like a reprobate, without any tokens of repentance; but at the intercession of Mary and Cæsarion he arose from the dead to confess and do penance, and returned from whence he came.

Pelbart of Temeswaer (that never sticks at anything), tells us of a robber on the highway, that used, nevertheless, to fast every Saturday in honour to the Virgin, who at last being caught in the fact, was beheaded on the spot. His head in falling from his body, called out thrice, "Confession, confession, confession;" upon which they fetched a priest, who came and set his head again upon his shoulders; to whom the thief reported that as soon as his head was cut off the devils had seized on his soul to drag it into hell, but that the Virgin hindered them, not permitting the soul and body quite to separate till he was confessed, and that he had obtained this grace for fasting every Saturday to her honour. And this serves to support two articles of Popery, the invocation of the Virgin and the necessity of confession. But if we will not believe Pelbart nor Father Crasset, neither will we heretics be persuaded that a rogue rose from the dead.

In the same place you read how that the soul of a soldier killed in fight in the service of the emperor Sigismund, continued in his body many years after the flesh was rotten and

* Crasset, p. 94. [Ibid.]

worn off; the blessed Virgin not permitting the soul to part before confession, because he had been all his lifetime her peculiar servant. Another miracle there is, of which Pelbart himself was an eye-witness. A certain wicked villain fell into the Danube, and was under water three days, where he heard a voice say to him, "Thou deservest well, O wretch, to lose thy life, and be condemned for ever for thy sins, but because thou art a servant to the Virgin Mary, thou shalt be delivered from this danger, that thou mayest go and be confessed." And up he came, though he could not swim a stroke, and came and confessed to Pelbart himself, who tells you this story. "'Twas from the man's own self," says Father Crasset, "that this religious Pelbart heard this history; and you must either believe this penitent was an impostor and cheat," (and I pray take heed of wronging such a pickled youth,) "or else that Pelbart* was a wicked man, and took delight to impose upon the belief of the sovereign high priest of Rome (to whom he dedicated his works), and all the faithful. Or else you must believe this story for a certain truth, and consequently that the Virgin does preserve sometimes her servants from everlasting damnation after death." And in the same page this worthy Jesuit says that Cæsarius the Cistercian, that lived about 400 years since, and made twelve books of Dialogues upon Miracles and Apparitions in his time, sets down many examples of this nature: how dead men were saved from damnation by the Virgin's means, obtaining grace for them to return to life again to do some penance.

If I would drain those springs (as Father Crasset does) of Pelbart, Cæsarius, Bernardin de Bustis, Vincentius Bellocensis, St. Antonine of Florence, and the rest, I could make a monstrous great volume of these fables, that tend to the establishing the necessity of worshipping the blessed Virgin: but this small number, drawn from Father Crasset, is as good as if I had heaped up all together with a great deal of pains and trouble.

For by this we Protestants may see how far we are to trust those Catholic doctors who would have us believe their service and religion has for many years last past been cleansed and purified from all these vain and idle popular superstitions. When Father Crasset, a famous Jesuit (though Monsieur Arnaud calls him "the wretched Jesuit Crasset"); a Jesuit, I

say, in the city of Paris, where Popery is most refined; in the face of Monsieur the Bishop of Meaux, and other Catholics averse from the vulgar superstitions; when he, I say again, renews and revives these silly and impertinent fables with the approbation of his society, his archbishop, and his king.* And if the great man at Rome should think fit to say, this book of Father Crasset is composed with so much learning, in such a method, and with such a discretion as is proper to instruct the readers clearly in few words, and to extort even from the unwilling (such as Monsieur de Meaux, and Monsieur Arnaud) a confession of the Catholic faith: (in this point) if he, I say, should but say thus much, I would fain know why it would not be as authentic a book as the Catholic Exposition of Monsieur de Condom. And are we (in good earnest) secure it never will be so? Will a better friend to Jesuits never possess that chair? And if there do, may he not do as much for such a book as this of Father Crasset's as the present Pope has done for Monsieur de Meaux's? And must the faith of Christ be at such uncertainties? This surely is not building on a rock, but on the sand, that every wave can wash away at pleasure. For if every Pope can make an exposition of the Catholic faith authentical (and if every one cannot, how can any one?), I do not see but we may have as many several faiths as there are casualties and diseases in the weekly bill.

* Of Louis le Grand.

THE VIRGIN MARY

MISREPRESENTED BY THE ROMAN CHURCH,

IN THE

TRADITIONS OF THAT CHURCH, CONCERNING HER LIFE AND GLORY; AND IN THE DEVOTIONS PAID TO HER AS THE MOTHER OF GOD. BOTH SHEWED OUT OF THE OFFICES OF THAT CHURCH, THE LESSONS ON HER FESTIVALS, AND FROM THEIR ALLOWED AUTHORS.

PART I.

Wherein two of her Feasts, her Conception and Nativity, are considered.

THE INTRODUCTION.

Giving an Account whence the Roman Church has so much to say concerning the Blessed Virgin, when the Scriptures and the ancient writers of the Church say so little of her.

THAT infallibility which the Church of Rome only challenges, and so much boasts of, can signify no less than this, that she expects that all Christians should securely commit, not only their faith, but also their devotions to be conducted by her. For it is not so necessary in religion to be instructed in all its articles and to believe aright, as it is duly to obey and serve God: nor is every wrong opinion so dangerous as false and mistaken worship. If a physician should proclaim himself for infallible, the reputation of his skill would quickly sink, if he failed ordinarily in the regimen of health, and made more distempers than he cured. And no wise traveller would choose him for the guide of his way, who, though he perfectly knew every step of it, yet was wont to lead those whom he conducted to repose themselves under trees of unhealthful shade and influence; and to bring them, for the quenching their thirst,

to those springs whose waters were neither clear nor wholesome. A learned person* of this Church is so sensible of this truth, that he is fain to defend, that their infallibility extends as far as to the canonization of saints; and that there can be no mistake committed herein; for, says he, "if in this matter the Church can be deceived and deceive, the pillar and ground of truth would totter and fall; the Lord Christ would forsake his spouse; the Holy Ghost would not teach those that are his all necessary truth; Peter would not in his successors feed the flock of Christ with the necessary food of religion; no, nor Jesus Christ himself the Prince of Shepherds; for he to whom the Pope gives his testimony, and pronounces, that he is authentically to be venerated with religious worship, and to be invoked with public prayers; if such an one may prove to be no saint, is it not plain that a false testimony is given, deadly poison, lying worship?" &c. Another great Spanish preacher says "the Catholic Church, which is governed by the Spirit of truth, cannot require the faithful to worship anything really false."† And Cardinal Bellarmine‡ gives us a great many reasons to prove that the Church cannot err in canonization of saints.

But how false this assertion is, has been shewn them in numerous instances§ not long since: that a great many of the saints they venerate are fabulous, and no evidence that such were ever in being; some canonized for saints that were boufeufs and traitors, heady and high-minded, such as spake evil of dignities and unjustly opposed the powers ordained of God. The reader will see false miracles and false tales advanced to give them reputation and credit; and, which is worse still, the falsity so apparent, that those who make use of them to abuse the simple thereby, must needs, if they be but tolerably knowing in history, be self-condemned. In fine, he will see so clearly that the interests of the world, and not those of true piety, both make many of their saints and warm their devotions to them, that he may well suspect, that in this Church faith has not been well preserved, when he sees so little regard had to the keeping of a good conscience. Yet I must

* Serarius in Litaneut. 2. Quest. 11.

† Carthagera de Arcan. Deip. l. 14. Hom. 13. Nihil re ipsa falsum Ecclesia Catholica, quæ spiritu veritatis regitur, colendum potest præcipere fidelibus.

‡ De Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 9.

§ V. Reflections on the Devotions of the Roman Church.

shew you far greater abuses than those, I mean such as are committed in their devotions to the blessed Virgin Mary.

Here we have a new scene opened, and a very strange one. They have put a sceptre into the hands of this handmaid of the Lord, as she calls herself;* they have advanced her into a throne by God himself; and, without asking his leave, call her the Queen of Heaven. Some of them give her the name of a goddess; and if we may judge of them by the worship they pay to her (which is the way the Scripture takes in the description of idolaters)† she is the goddess of this Church. They doat so much upon her divine excellencies, that they fancy God himself to fall in love with her as his spouse: and a late bold Jesuit‡ dares to give this for a reason, why she is not a goddess, because there can be but three persons in the Deity, otherwise, *Deus Deam vellet, si posset*; “God has kindness enough to make her one if he could.”

Who can forbear, when he considers the madness of this worship, from crying out, “Lord! into what extravagant folly and heights of impiety does that superstition run, where the wisdom of men prescribes the way of their religion, without consulting their Maker?” For we may as well put the question to this Church, as Epiphanius did of old to the Collyridians, *ποία δέ τις γραφή διηγίσατο περὶ τούτου*, &c. “What Scripture hath told us anything of this?” What prophet has given leave to worship any man, much less a woman? The great silence of the Scripture in this matter is acknowledged by themselves (as we shall see by and by), and the reader will meet with admirable reasons why this Church is so copious in giving an account of her, when the Scriptures say nothing of it. In the meantime, I cannot but mention a complaint that Pet. Cluniacensis once made (as Espencæus § relates it) of the service of St. Benet: “That among the false canticles in the Church of God, and among the loud trifles that were odious to him, on the feast of the great father Benet, he heard a hymn sung, and was compelled to bear a part in it, in which song he found at least four and twenty lies.” This trade you see went pretty forward in this Church above five hundred years ago; but since that time it is vastly improved, and in the case of the blessed Virgin, above all other saints, the fictions

* Luke i. 38.

† Isa. xlii. 17. and cap. xlv. 15, 16, &c.

‡ Ph. de Convent. *Theatr. excellentiar. Deip.* p. 20.

§ In 2 Ep. ad Timoth. c. 4. §. 21.

are far more numerous and bold, because they bear proportion to that height to which their fancies have advanced her. This plain dealing our adversaries cannot bear, and no wonder, since nothing can more vex a cheat than to be discovered. All that have remarkably contributed to this have been loaded with their calumnies, alive or dead, no matter which. Thus they have told the world that Luther,* like a jolly glutton, having made a large meal at supper, the devil the same night strangled him in his bed: that Calvin† rotted alive, and died of the lousy disease: and a Cretian liar‡ forces the learned Casaubon to prove, in almost half a chapter of his book,§ that his father was not hanged, as the Jesuit had reported of him. But the most spiteful charge against us, and, if it were true, not to be answered, is, that Protestants cast contempt upon the blessed Virgin herself. Bellarmine says, "The heretics now give no honour to the Virgin."|| And Coster, the Jesuit, accuses us, "That we reduce the mother of God into the rank of ordinary women; and with impure tongues fear not to blaspheme her, as one obnoxious to sin, to vicious perturbations of soul, and to the wrath of God."¶ Wherein they deal with us, as they did with the opposers of their superstition heretofore; for thus Th. Rynaucius** reports of the Albigenses, that they called the blessed Virgin *Monoculam et meretricem*. But our adversaries themselves, in another mood, will be our compurgators in this matter. Carthagena†† has mustered up the sayings of many of the first Reformers, giving large encomiums to the blessed Virgin, such as any Catholic might repeat after them, and particularly cites this saying of Calvin, "I trust in God it shall never be said of me, that I have an aversion to Mary, towards whom not to be well affected, I esteem it a certain sign of a reprobate mind." And Canisius‡‡ gives singular thanks to immortal God, who not only "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings, but even of adversaries, has perfected his mother's praise." There needs but a little charity to make any one believe that it is in no ways likely, while we profess to adore the Son, that we should think

* Cochleus in Actis Lutheri.

† Hier. Bolsec. in vit. Calv.

‡ Andr. Eudæmon Johan.

§ Exercit. 1. Sect. 4.

|| De Sanct. Beat. c. 13.

¶ Præf. ad Med. de vit. et laud. B. Virgin.

** Diptycha Marian. p. 233.

†† Lib. 6. de Arcan. Deip. Homil. 17. §. 3.

‡‡ Citante eod. ibid.

meanly, much less speak contemptuously or blasphemously of the mother. No, we are so far from it, that we are always ready to own her as a most blessed person ; and that she was endued with excellencies far above the common size of her sex. And though we cannot determine the measures of her virtue and sanctity, yet we are sure they were such as deserve always to be admired by us, and imitated. We admire particularly her singular privilege in being chosen to be the mother of our Lord ; and acknowledge, that she wanted no gifts nor graces that might qualify her thereunto. But as we are persuaded, that we come not short in giving her all due praises ; so we think it both possible and dangerous, *ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον δοξάζειν*, to “advance her above what is meet,” as Epiphanius* speaks, and we bewail the sad instances of this in the Roman Church ; and are not to be blamed if we avoid this rock, as well as that other *τῶν κατευτελιζόντων τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον*, of those that “undervalue the holy Virgin.” The same Father has cautioned us, “that we are not to honour the saints above what is befitting, but to honour him that is their Lord :”† and we unfeignedly consent to what he says, *ἐν τιμῇ ἔσω Μαρία*, “Let Mary be honoured :” adding withal, “Let the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be adored, but let no man adore or worship Mary.”‡ In a word, we heartily subscribe to what one of their own poets say of her.§

Non est laudis inops Virgo, tot floribus Hybla
 Non redolet—segetes non tot spicantur aristis
 Per Libyam, quot sancta parens præconia laudum
 Verarum, si quæris, habet ; figmenta relinque,
 Et quod scire nequis, ne divinare labora
 Incassum—

That is,

The Virgin lacks no praise, not Hybla yields
 More flowers, nor ears of corn in Libyan fields
 So fair and thick as her true virtues rise :
 Think not to grace her then with specious lies ;
 Nor give her those perfections by fond guess,
 Thou ne'er canst find, and only make her less.

Here, indeed, lies one great difference betwixt us and them,

* In Hæres. 79. [vol. 1. p. 1058. Colon. 1682.]

† Epiph. *ibid.* *πέρα τοῦ δέοντος οὐ χρὴ, τιμᾶν τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλὰ τιμᾶν τὸν αὐτῶν δεσπότην.*

‡ ὁ δὲ πατήρ, καὶ υἱός, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα προσκυνέσθωσαν, τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνεῖτω. [*Ibid.* p. 1064.]

§ Fast. l. 12. de Concept. Virg.

that we, observing that it is the plain design of the holy writers, in the particular account they give of the wondrous birth, and life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, to engage all men to believe that he is the Christ,* the Son of God; that our eternal life depends upon our knowing him who is the only true God,† and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; that there is no salvation in any other, nor any other name ‡ under heaven given among men but his, whereby we must be saved; and that having the power of judging all the world committed to him, all men are bound § to honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; we, I say, finding this to be the great concern and scope of the Gospel, are well satisfied with those few words of truth and soberness, we meet with there, that relate to the blessed Virgin his mother; and we are not needlessly curious to inquire any farther. ¶ It is plain it was him they designed to advance and not her: even the Holy Spirit's overshadowing her virgin womb, was rather intended to proclaim the glory and majesty of his incarnation, than of her conception. The Scripture mentions some other instances of her faith and piety, wherein it places her chief happiness, as St. Augustine's known saying expresses it: || "Mary was more blessed in receiving the faith of Christ, than by conceiving the flesh of Christ:" for "*Materna propinquitās nihil Mariæ profuisset nisi felicius Christum corde quam carne gestasset*; her nearness to him as a mother had not profited her, if she had not been more happy in bearing Christ in her heart than in her womb." Which also our Saviour confirms in that saying of his, ¶¶ "Yea, rather, blessed are they which hear the word of God, and keep it." As for other matters concerning her, where the Scriptures have not gone before us, we are contented to remain in the dark; concluding that we are not one way or other much concerned in them; for if we had, God would no doubt have declared them to us. We think it necessary for the honour of our Lord to believe, that his mother remained a virgin till she bare him and brought him forth: we think it highly probable too, that the honour of our Lord preserved her a virgin ever after; and we detest the bad spirit of Helvidius, that made a

* John xx. 31.

† John xvii. 3.

‡ Acts iv. 12.

§ John v. 22.

|| Tom. 6. de Lab. Sanct. Virgin. Beatior ergo Maria percipiēdo fidem Christi, quam concipiēdo carnem Christi. [vol. 11. p. 763. Bassan. 1797.]

¶¶ Luke xi. 28.

contest of it, and brought it into dispute in the Church. But yet we are of the great St. Basil's mind, that if she had not remained a virgin afterwards, μηδὲν τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλυμαίνεταί λόγῳ, "the doctrine according to godliness would not have suffered by it;" and therefore we lay not such stress upon it as upon the former, ἀπολυπραγμόνητον καταλείψομεν, "We leave it without anxious inquiry about it." But now this Church having as much business with the Virgin as with Christ himself, and making indeed more stir about her; the modesty of the first faith, and the silence of the Scripture gives them but little comfort; if they cannot find in the old Gospel enough to proclaim her a fit object of men's worship, and to engage their religious addresses to her, rather than fail of this, which they are resolved upon, they will make a new Gospel which the Apostles never preached; and venture the curse that is threatened to them that do so, Gal. i. 8. First, indeed, the words of the Scripture must be wire-drawn, and every syllable that relates to her stretched and set upon the tenters; but still they find that "bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it."† They are therefore resolved to add where that is defective, and to feign those privileges for her which they cannot find there. To shew a little their fine way of proceeding in this matter.

They have laid down this for an undoubted rule, as any aphorism in Hippocrates, that "*Mensura perfectionum B. Virginis est maternitas Dei*. Her being the mother of God is the measure of the perfections of the blessed Virgin." Not to dispute at present the truth of it, which may be granted in a sober sense, let us see what conclusions they draw from it. Aquinas ‡ infers, "that the blessed Virgin, because she is the mother of God, has a kind of infinite dignity belonging to her from that infinite good which is God; and that in this respect nothing better than she could be created, as there can be nothing better than God." Ant. Spinellus, the Jesuit, says, § "From this motherhood of God, that maxim owned by all divines is drawn, viz. that there is no gift of grace that was ever granted to any poor creature, which was not bestowed upon the Virgin in a like or more perfect manner unless it were repugnant to her sex.

* Homil. de Humana Christi generatione.

† Isa. xxviii. 20.

‡ P. l. qu. 25. art. 6. ad 4tum.

§ Maria Deip. thronus Dei, c. 5. s. 4.

Wherefore all the graces, virtues, and privileges divided among other saints, are found collected in her alone.” And they are very fond of that saying of St. Bernard,* “Whatsoever has been granted to other saints, though but to a few, we are not to suspect that it has been denied to so glorious a Virgin.” Aquinas,† in another place, from these principles has deduced her sanctification before she was born; the privilege never to have committed any sin, mortal or venial, and a fulness of all graces above others. This, one would judge, is pretty fair; but a daring Jesuit,‡ resolving to enlarge the charter of her privileges, has advanced this position, that “all true theology does require, that in those things that belong to the greater glory of Jesus and his mother, if the Church does not prohibit it” (and they are sure it will not interpose to the hindrance of the mother at least), “we are not to look what two or three, five or ten doctors have said in the case, but what will best defend and secure the honour of Mary and Jesus.” Here now the door is set wide open to give admittance to all the throng of fables that any one will invent, under pretence to advance her honour: the Evangelists have said truth enough to make Jesus glorious; and they are resolved to try what may be done for Mary in the other way: and every monk or nun of a busy fancy is perpetually teeming forth some new privilege to grace the blessed Virgin withal. Albertus Magnus § had got them up to fourteen. Vinc. Bandelis || reckons twelve privileges bestowed on her from the fourteenth year of her age and afterwards, which, considering this date of them, is an increase: but Spinellus has made them up above a score, ¶ which I will set down out of him, that the reader may try how many of them he could have collected by perusing the four Gospels, without the help of those forenamed principles. They are these: “1. She was not only elected by God, but pre-elected before all others, Cant. vi. 8, 9. ‘There are sixty queens, and eighty concubines, and virgins without number: my beloved, my undefiled is but one, the only one of her mother, the choice one of her that bare her.’ 2. That she was promised by

* Epist. ad Can. Lugdun. Quod itaque vel paucis mortalium constat fuisse collatum, fas certe non est suspiciari tantæ Virgini esse negatum.

† Part 3. q. 27. art. 1, 4, 5.

‡ J. Baptista Poza Elucidar. l. 13. tr. 16. p. 1050.

§ De Laud. Virg. super missus est.

|| De Concept. Virg. part 2. p. 183.

¶ Maria Thronus Dei, c. 20. p. 252, 253.

Heaven to the fathers, prefigured by mystical miracles, foretold by prophetic oracles, and by the sibyls was honourably predicted. 3. That she sprang by the kindness of God from barren parents, that vowed to give to God the offspring he should bestow on them; that an angel foretold her nativity to her parents, which we do not read in the Scriptures concerning any other woman (no, nor of her neither there). 4. That she only, of all the children of Adam, that descended from him by the ordinary way of propagation (*per seminale rationem*) was free from original sin. 5. That in the very beginning of her immaculate conception, she was so confirmed in grace, that ever after she was without stain of actual, though but venial, sin. 6. That the *fomes peccati*, that which like tinder so soon kindles in us, was extinct in her; so that she never was sensible of that tyrannous law of the members, or the rebellion of the lower part. 7. That in her very conception she had the use of reason, and made a vow of virginity to God; from which instant also she began to merit, and that the merit of her works was never interrupted, not so much as in her sleep. 8. That in the same conception of hers she was adorned with all theological and cardinal virtues; and that in the heroic degree, as well as with all the *gratiæ gratis datæ*, graces freely given. 9. That at the age of three years she was in the temple, according to her parents' vow, consecrated to God, and there was most holily educated. 10. That this blessed person among women escaped all that curse to which mankind, by reason of Adam's sin, was obnoxious. 11. That she alone, that had conceived without any lustful pleasure, did not undergo the irksomeness that other women with child are subject. 12. That by a virgin birth she brought forth God without pain. 13. That the Lord's body exhibited in the holy eucharist, is formed of her blood in her virgin womb, which therefore is compared, Cant. vii. to a heap of wheat set about with lilies. 14. That she in a singular manner did many ways co-operate to our salvation. 15. That the fruit of Christ's passion was in a singular manner communicated to her; and, standing courageously by the cross of her Son, she was pierced through with the sword of grief, and therefore she first of all saw Christ when he arose from the dead. 16. That she was the instructor and mistress of the apostles and teachers. 17. That her body did not see corruption; but being assumed, and taken up to heaven in body and soul before the common resurrection, she was placed above the choirs of angels and

orders of saints, at the right hand of her Son, where she makes a distinct order (chorus) above them all, and she alone obtained more glory than all the rest of the saints and angels put together. 18. That her presence brought a great deal of accidental joy to the blessed in heaven. 19. That she is the queen of heaven, and lady of all the angels and saints. 20. That she is the common advocate of sinners, the mother of mercy, the mediatrix to intercede for them; and that she also is the mother of the living, and promotes the salvation of all men. 21. That she is formidable and terrible to the devils, that they presently fly away at the mention of her name, and much more at her command; and that she hath powerfully broken their head. 22. That all the graces and privileges that are dispersed among other saints are found united in her after a far more perfect manner." Thus far he. But others * have enlarged her privileges to above a hundred.

These are a few instances among many which will afterwards occur, that give the reader a taste of the new faith and gospel concerning the Virgin Mary which is taught in this Church. With such particulars as these the hymns and lessons of their Breviaries are stuffed: for to establish the belief of them many of their festivals are instituted; and to the scandal of Christianity, as well as to the eternal reproach of their missions, Jerome Xaverius, a Jesuit, in the History of Christ which he published in the Persian tongue, A.D. 1602, being commanded to give an account of the life and actions of our Saviour by the Great Mogul, he, not contenting himself with an impartial delivery of that faith which the Apostles taught, and was once delivered to the saints, has, together with the Gospel story, interwoven idle tales and fabulous legends, derived from gossiping tradition, or taken out of books confessed by themselves to be apocryphal, and the fictions of ancient heretics, especially what refers to the blessed Virgin; which I suppose he intended for this end, that all his converts should set her up for an object of their religious veneration; otherwise that first faith might have been sufficient for them which served those first Christians, and made them wise unto salvation, who only worshipped God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

From all that has been said it cannot but appear, that this

* Paul Comitulus reckons up one hundred and thirty privileges. Ale-gambe Bibl. p. 363.

Church has made a very bold attempt, for which they must answer one day to God, among the *οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the many that have *adulterated the word of God*, and corrupted it by their bad mixtures. And their shame will still more appear, when their sorry pretences for doing all this are laid down and examined, which I shall now give a further account of.

They confess* that it has been the complaint of many, and who have taken it very ill (*ægre ferentium*) that the canonical Scriptures have given us no history of the nativity, gests, and death of the blessed Virgin. Strange, say they, that they should be silent in matters of so great moment. "For," says Pelbartus,† "Matthew (chap. i.) writing the genealogy of Christ, says only 'Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.' I thought he ought to have said, the husband of Mary, who was the daughter of Joachim, whom he miraculously begat of Anne his wife, an angel being employed to foretel it, and who was a most chaste virgin, &c. Which complaint seems the more reasonable, because the Evangelists, in the case of his fore-runner, John the Baptist, have described his birth, and the dignity of his parents, the holiness of his life, and the difficult and famous passages of it unto the end of his life and martyrdom; therefore much more ought they to have done thus of the mother of God," &c.

It is very easy for us to assail this objection by telling these bold men, that it is not needful for us to know anything further in this matter, when God thinks fit to say nothing to us: and let them prove, if they can, concerning John the Baptist, whose story the Scripture has told, that it was unnecessary for us to know that. We may also add (if we had a mind to be guessing) what if the cause of the Scripture's silence about her birth, &c., be the same which one of their own Jesuits‡ gives about the place of Moses's burial, which God would let no man know of, "lest the Israelites, who were prone to idolatry, should take so admirable and almost divine a man for a god, and worship him?" Who also adds, that "this, in all probability, was the subject of the contest between Michael the archangel and the devil (which St. Jude mentions, ver. 9)

* Carthagera de S. arcan. Deip. l. 13. hom. 1.

† Stellar. Coron. l. 7. p. 1. art. 1.

‡ Bonfrerius, in Deut. xxxiv. 6.

about the body of Moses, that the devil would have the sepulchre in which the body lay to be discovered, that thereby he might draw the Israelites to idolatry, and Michael would have it hid to prevent it."

But they who must have the matters that concern the blessed Virgin discovered, will find the solution of it a harder task. Yet something they will say, though little to the purpose, to unfold the "mystery of this spiritual omission," as Pelbartus phrases it.* The author of the Pomærium says that this omission was "to excite the devotion of the faithful more towards her, that they might more greedily inquire after her actions, her life and death." So indeed we see foolish children cry the loudest after that which cannot be had: but I think those devotions had better go out than flame, where God affords not his holy fires to kindle them, nor any fuel to maintain them. Otherwise, as a Sorbonne doctor† wisely notes, "When devotion only governs the Church, though it be the best (*i. e.* in the fervency and degree of it), yet it may sometimes speciously deceive." Gregorius Gallicanus‡ would bring off the matter thus: "Many," says he, "are of this opinion, that Christ resolved that he himself, and no other pen or tongue besides, would explain the praises of his mother; therefore in the Canticles he has elegantly drawn her from head to foot, when he put the pencil into Solomon's hand to describe her." Which indeed is a good reason to prove that a thousand of their books concerning her might be burnt, since theirs must needs be superfluous, after that draft of her to the life in the Canticles of Christ's own doing. Aloys. Novarinus§ thought himself no doubt very witty, when he gave this answer to the objection: "*Credo rei magnitudine pressos, &c.* I believe the Evangelists," says he, "being oppressed with the greatness and difficulty of the thing, abstained from meddling with that which by no labour or skill of theirs they could perform: wherefore, like skilful painters, they drew a veil, that under the covering and shade of silence we might conjecture the more concerning her, because they had expressed nothing." To which reasoning I shall only make these two demands.

1. How came they to have the presumption to undertake that which the inspired writers found too heavy for their shoulders,

* Loc. Citat.

† Claud. Joly. *Traditio antiqua* adv. Jac. Gaudinum, p. 178.

‡ Mariale, p. 4.

§ Umbra Virg. p. 58. n. 187.

and would not meddle with ? 2. Whence should arise this difficulty of describing her to them who had drawn the lines of our Saviour's life, and finished it, unless he imagine greater glories and excellencies in the mother than in the Son of God ? Canisius is very angry with us,* and charges us with a "heinous error for denying at this time so many things concerning Mary and her dignity, which though not taken notice of in the Scriptures, nor presently delivered in the time of the Apostles, yet have been revealed by God to the latter ages as certain, and at length recommended for such by the Church." This indeed is somewhat to the purpose, for no man can reasonably require that God should manifest a thing sooner than he has a mind to, nor complain that that was not known in a former which he himself reserved for a latter age ; only that we may avoid being cheated, we expect as good evidence for the latter that they are divine, as God has given for the former ; but without this the Church's recommendation will not create faith in us, especially not that of their Church, which has played so many tricks in religion. Poza† has this farther fetch : "By this silence we are told, that there is nothing written in the Gospels, nothing in the law and prophets, which does not, after a sort, appertain to Mary." And in another place:‡ "If you would comprise in short what is more largely diffused in the Scriptures, know that Mary is the sum and brief of them all." Carthagenas§ thinks that this is a "contrivance of the Divine Wisdom, because this silence does commend her excellencies more fully than the most eloquent tongue can do ; since her dignity and sanctity, supposing her to be the mother of Jesus, is a first principle, of which there need be nothing said." And so too the author of the first reason|| says, "Whatsoever belongs to her dignity, &c. is *per se notum*, known of itself by those who have an entire faith in Jesus." This I see is the solution they most insist on. So Suarez:¶ "Few things are said in the Gospels of her, because the intention of the Evangelists was wholly carried out to Christ" (thus far we are of his mind, and wish that they also had made him their scope more, and her less) ;

* Lib. 4. de Deip. c. 22. p. 478.

† Elucidar. lib. 2. tract. 7. c. 1.

§ De Arcan. Deip. l. 2. hom. 2.

|| Author Pumerii, loc. citat.

¶ Præfat. ad tom. 2. in 3. partem.

‡ Ibid. tract. 6. c. 1.

“but he being known, and his faith enough established, her excellencies could not be unknown or hid.” Or, as Sherlog the Jesuit expresses it,* “It was necessary for us to know that Mary was the mother of Christ; this the Evangelists sufficiently declared, and this her honour being manifested, the rest might be collected therefrom, though they said no more.” The force of this reasoning will appear, if you only change the name of Jesus for Mary, and put it thus: “It was requisite for us to know that Jesus was the Son of God (as necessary as that Mary was his mother); this the Evangelists sufficiently declared, and this dignity of his being manifested, the rest might be collected, though they said no more.” We should have had an admirable Gospel if this had been the way of writing it; much what I suppose like the History of the Seven Champions; for that writer did not feign the men, their worth and excellency was abundantly declared to the world before; he only collected, as every writer of romances does, what was proper for such worth to accomplish, and his fancy ran much upon enchanted castles, and giants with huge maces in their hands, which he makes his heroes to dissolve and overcome. However, we have discovered, by what these authors have told us, a secret which they had better have kept so still; that now we know what way has been taken in writing the history of the blessed Virgin, and the lives of other saints. Two or three truths have been given, like a ground to a skilful musician; upon these they have run what division they best fancied, and according to the skill of the writer, the descant has been agreeable or otherwise; and it is remarkable, that commonly where any faithful and certain records have said the least, there they have given the world the most large and complete story. Which we are beholden to the aforesaid Greg. Gallicanus† for confessing the most plainly, and without any disguise, as the sense of some in this very case of the Scripture’s silence concerning the blessed Virgin: *Dicunt aliqui, immensum esse laudum B. Virginis campum, ideoque liberum unicuique relinquere voluisse* (sc. Deum) *ut de ed dicerent quod vellent, i. e.* “The field of her praises is wide and immense, and therefore God would leave every man at liberty to say of her what he pleased.”

* Anteloq. 3 in Cantic. n. 142.

† Marial. p. 3.

CHAP. I.

An Account of the Current Faith of the Roman Church concerning the blessed Virgin, and of the worship they pay to her suitable to that belief; beginning with her Predestination, to her Nativity.

WHATSOEVER I have asserted in the foregoing introduction will appear more clearly in that romantic history this Church has given us of the blessed Virgin's life. Wherein we shall see both what the Church believes concerning her; and after that, what worship they pay to her, agreeable to that belief. And in doing this, I hope I shall not incur any reader's censure, no not so much as of the Romanist for taking this method, since they themselves have given it me, in their own offices upon the feasts that are appointed to her honour: wherein we find these two are interwoven, her history and her worship. To have set down only the last, *viz.* her worship, would have been to present a naked image of strange devotion, enough to have frightened any Christian. The flattery of her being so fulsome;* the veneration of a mere creature; so submiss and lowly;† the expectations of receiving blessings from her so high and excessive,‡ that if there had been

* "She infinitely surpasseth all the 'excellencies of men and angels.' Contemplations of the Life and Glory of holy Mary, p. 18. "As it is not possible for the tongue of a seraphim to explain to our comprehension the shapes and liveries of the heavenly spirits, their choirs and hierarchies, to blazon the glories of the saints, and to expound the plenty, pastimes and language of the divine courtiers, so much rather is it impossible for a pure creature to unfold the immense attributes of the maternity of holy Mary, the mother of Jesus; which gives to her an inherent right to all the perfections, so copiously by Providence dispersed amongst creatures here beneath, the stars in the firmament, and the angels in heaven." Ibid. Ep. Dedic.

† "Whatsoever can be said of her, will be only an essay, infinitely too narrow to fill the orbs of her exuberant sanctity, grace and glory.—I do with trembling attempt this great work (of explaining the mysteries of her life and immortal glory), lest searching into the holies of so great a majesty, I be oppressed with its brightness and splendours." Ibid. Epist. Dedic.—"Entering a solemn covenant with holy Mary, to be for ever her servant. Ibid. p. 12.—"All Christians vow obedience, fealty and homage to her, as to their supreme governess, liege-lady and advocate," Ibid. p. 21.—"She justly claims a servitude from all pure creatures." Ibid. p. 8.

‡ "Almighty God hath, by a solemn covenant, pronounced her to be the treasury of wisdom, grace and sanctity under Jesus; so that whatsoever gifts are bestowed upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the media-

nothing said to give a rise to such courtship, it could not escape the censure of extravagant madness; whereas the history clothes the image with an advantageous dress, and gives some colour at least to those applications,* while it represents her not only in herself a subject of excellencies and perfections, far above those of men and angels, and nearly bordering upon the Divinity; but also one, who, in the intention of God, was designed to have a great hand in the conducting us to happiness, a helper and co-worker with our Saviour himself in the work of our redemption, and thereby fairly challenging a great share in our veneration. So that if the things they say of her were but evidently true, the things they say to her in their devotions might be the better borne withal and justified.

To prepare us for what we may expect to hear of her, when they bring her upon the stage of the world, give me leave only to premise, how they consider her in the divine decree, before she was conceived and born into the world.

SECT. I.

Of the Blessed Virgin's Predestination.

Lectio. Prov. S.

Missal: Rom. ad Sept. 8. et 8. Decemb.

"Dominus possedit me in initio viarum suarum, antequam quicquam faceret ab initio. Ab æterno ordinata sum, ab antiquis antequam terra fieret. Nondum erant abyssi et ego concepta eram; necdum montes gravi mole constiterant, ante colles parturiebar, &c.

"The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, from the beginning before he made any thing. I was ordained

tion of Mary; [no one being gracious to Jesus, who is not devoted to Mary: nor hath any one been specially confident of the patronage of Mary, who hath not through her received a special blessing from Jesus: whence it is one great mark of the predestination of the elect to be singularly devoted to Mary; since she hath a full power, as a mother, to obtain of Jesus whatsoever he can ask of God the Father.—Neither hath any one petitioned Mary, who was refused by Jesus; or trusted in Mary, and was abandoned by Jesus." Ibid. p. 7.

Our Saviour speaks of many who shall say to him, Lord, Lord, and yet he would not know them; but it should seem by this, if they had but known the secret of saying, Lady, Lady, they would nothave miscarried.

from everlasting, and of old before the earth was made. When there was no abyss I was already conceived; the heavy mountains were not yet settled, I was brought forth before the hills."

Capitulum Eccles. 24.

Brev. Rom. ad 8. Sept. et 8. Decemb.

"Ab initio et ante sæcula creata sum, et usque ad futurum non desinam, et in habitatione sanctâ coram ipso ministravi.

"From the beginning and before all ages I was created, and I shall never fail; and I ministered before him in the holy habitation."

The late Contemplations of the Life and Glory of the holy Mary have given us a formal office, for the eternal predestination of the mother of Jesus; which runs thus :

e Praise.

"Hail Mary, full of grace, our Lord is with thee; blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and in the hour of our death.

"*Vers.* Open my lips, O mother of Jesus;

"*Resp.* And my soul shall speak forth thy praise.

"*V.* Divine Lady, be intent to mine aid;

"*R.* Graciously make haste to help me.

"*V.* Glory be to Jesus and Mary;

"*R.* As it was, is, and ever shall be.*

The Hymn.

"All hail, most high, most holy one,

"Above the angels, beneath the Son," &c.

Sad-rhymes.

Anthem.

"I was pre-ordained from the beginning, before the creation of the world; my habitation was in the highest, and my throne was seated on a pillar of light.

Psalm 8.

"Mary, mother of Jesus, how wonderful is thy name, even to the ends of the earth!

"All magnificence be given to Mary; and let her be exalted above the stars and angels.

"Reign on high as queen of seraphims and saints; and be thou crowned with honour and glory.

"Innocency and mercy hath exalted thy name above the sphere of pure creatures

"Exceeding glorious is Mary, the mother of Jesus; thy name is wonderful above the clouds.

"Glory be to Jesus and Mary, as it was, is, and ever shall be. Amen.

"*Anth.* I was pre-ordained.

"*V.* Holy Mary, mother of God;

"*R.* Pray for us, sinners, now, and in the hour of our death.

The Blessing.

"Through the merits and intercession of the mother of Jesus may we come safe to the harbour of eternal salvation.

"*V.* Bid us be blessed, O holy Mary;

"*R.* Bless us, O Mary, the mother of Jesus.

The Lesson.

"I issued forth out of the bosom of God on high, the first conceived before all creatures; my abode is in the depths, and my throne in a pillar of light. He who made me, took his rest in my tabernacle: my inheritance is in the choicest blessings of my God, and my possession in the fulness of the saints. For I am the mother of beautiful love, of holy fear, knowledge and hope. In me is all grace of truth, and righteous ways, and all hope of life and virtue.

"*V.* Be thou, O Mary, merciful to us.

"*R.* And by thee be all glory to Jesus.

The Cantique.

"Let us praise thee, O mother of Jesus, let us acknowledge thee our sovereign lady.

"Let angels and men give honour to thee, the first conceived of all pure creatures.

"To thee the morning stars and highest seraphims, sing glory for thy magnificence.

"Make intercession for us, O powerful mother of Jesus; for God will not refuse thee our petitions.

"Then shall we rejoice in the fulness of thy glory, and shall sing the praises of Jesus for ever."

REMARKS.

It were easy, if it were as needful, to give the reader a large catalogue of the ancients, who have made use of the forenamed places in the Proverbs, to prove the divinity of our Saviour against the Arians, understanding Wisdom there, of him who is the uncreated Wisdom of God. But just as they have betrayed the Christian cause against the heathens, in the case of images, since the same distinctions and answers this Church makes use of to defend their worship of them, may all be pleaded for the justifying the heathen idolatry in that particular: so by their application of these places of Scripture to the blessed Virgin, which the Fathers generally thought did belong only to Christ, and proved his existence before all ages of the world, they have plainly put answers into the mouths of those heretics, to evacuate the force of all those arguments; for those places may then be applied to Christ, though supposed a creature and a mere man, as well as to her who must be acknowledged to be a mere woman. Carthagena* is so sensible of this, that not being able to deny what by the authority of his Church he is forced to own, nor yet to disown the other, he thus agrees the matter: "Since those things which are spoken of the infinite Wisdom of God, are verified also of the blessed Virgin, it is necessary that, from the infinity of the Son, she borrow a kind of infinite dignity; and from thence those words may agree to both, though in a different sense." And another thus:† "What was said of the eternal Wisdom by eternal birthright and property, is applied to her by the wisdom of the Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, by attribution and participation: Our Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways."

This therefore is now their business, to advance her as high as is possible, and to give her prerogatives above all other creatures, of which many of their authors‡ make this to be one, "that after Christ, she was elected the first of all others." So our Contemplator,§ "Thou wast the first and most delicious object of God's love towards pure creatures from the beginning of eternity." Which they illustrate thus:|| "As God decreed

* L. 1. de Arc. Deip. ho. 2. p. 9.

† Carre, Sweet Thoughts of Jesus and Mary, p. 293.

‡ Cited by Raynaudus, Dipt. Mar. p. 130.

§ Contemplat. L. and Gl. of Mary, p. 21.

|| Carthagena, ibid. p. 7.

to constitute our first parent Adam to be the head of mankind, and gave him Eve for his companion, taken out of his side while he was asleep; so for the reparation of mankind, he predestinated Christ to be the Head of another spiritual offspring, and out of his side, whilst he slept upon the cross, he brought out this second Eve, the mother of all living by grace." And to this purpose they cite Prov. viii. 25, "Before the mountains were settled, before the hills I was brought forth;" that is,* I was brought forth before all angels by predestination (for they are the high hills by reason of the sublimity of their nature and glory). "When there were no depths I was brought forth," ver. 24; that is, when original sin, which is like a profound and obscure abyss, was not yet considered as foreseen by God. One has dared to address thus to God:† "You yourself, O great God, took pleasure to entertain yourself before all time, in this sweet and agreeable cogitation, that Mary would be a most perfect and accomplished creature; and that she alone would give you more glory than all angels, saints, and men together: and that God comforted himself, by considering her for the loss and ruin that would be caused by the insolent rebellion of the third part of the angels, by the disobedience of the first man, and by the horrible deluge that would make the world a frightful solitude in the days of Noah." Nay, they go so far as to say,‡ "that all the elect are predestinated for her sake." And therefore she is called by such Fathers as Germanus,§ "The business of all ages, the scope and end of all God's counsels." And the spurious St. Bernard,|| "*De hac, et propter hanc omnis Scriptura facta est, propter hanc totus mundus factus est,*" &c. "The Scriptures were intended for her, and the world made for her sake." "And not only made," says another,¶ "out of love to the Virgin, but sustained also; for the world, by reason of our wicked deeds, could no ways consist, unless the glorious Virgin, praying for us, with her mercy and clemency, did sustain it." This was Christ's prerogative, if we believe the Apostle, Col. i. 16, 17, "All things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist:" now, if we believe these men, she comes in for a share in these peculiarities, by which Christ

* Spinellus. *ibid.* c. 14. p. 198.

† Nierembergius, *L'aimable Mere de Jesus*, cap. 8. p. 59.

‡ Raynaudus, *ibid.* p. 131.

§ Orat. de Præsent. Deip.

|| Serm. 3. super salve Regina.

¶ Galatinus de Arcanis, l. 7. c. 2.

was once distinguished from all creatures. For thus Alcazar* maintains, "That by reason of the union of the blessed Virgin with Christ, the Holy Ghost, in a secondary sense intended by him, has expressed the Virgin in those very places of Scripture which are spoken of Christ in the first and primary sense." And now we may the less wonder to hear another† "referring all the wonderful effects of our predestination to glory, election by grace, and redemption from sin through the blood of Jesus, to the excellent perfections of Mary, as a most effectual means of all—acknowledging all these blessings to flow from Jesus to all through Mary, and may therefore refer them all to her, as the most effectual instrument, channel, and conveyance of all." Though I must say, this is new logic, as well as new divinity, to refer all to the means and to the conveyance, instead of the end and original spring; just as if a man should refer all the light in his room to his window (not to the sun and fountain of it), because the light shines through it. But none has so copiously and audaciously discussed this matter as the Jesuit Salazar,‡ beginning at those words, Prov. viii. 22, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old." "When God," says he, "began to create the world, he possessed me (Mary), that is, he conceived in his mind, and contemplated me as present. And the end of it was, 1. Because he went more cheerfully about his work, foreseeing that Mary would at length be brought into being, under whose empire all things which he then created should come into subjection. 2. God carefully searched out what were the excellencies of every creature, that he might heap those perfections upon her, that so she might become a new and no fabulous Pandora, made up of all their perfections. 3. Because, as God foresaw that man would fall from his obedience and ruin the creation, so Mary was the cause why he did not upon this desist from his purpose of creating the world, and alter his mind, foreseeing that by her all the ruins of the creation would be restored and repaired. 4. He foresaw, too, that the world he intended to make would decay and wax old, and presently Mary came into his mind, who would bring freshness and youth to it when it was aged. 5. Because as God, by the word *fiat* (let it be), repeated several times, did produce all things, and bestowed

* Lib. 4. in Apoc. c. 2. v. 1. not. 2.

† Contempl. L. and Gl. of Mary, p. 10.

‡ Comment. in Prov. viii. 22, &c. num. 260, &c.

on them all their powers; so by the same word used but once (by Mary) she should renew them all." (Which is a great mistake, unless he thinks γεννηθήτω in the Septuagint, and γένουρό μοι in St. Luke, to be the same. But of this *fiat* we shall hear him blaspheming farther upon another occasion.)

Upon ver. 23, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was:" these are some of his admirable contemplations.* "1. That if we should suppose this impossibility, that all things were not objected at once to the mind of God, but that he needed counsel and deliberation, and to know one thing from and after another; verily, Mary is so excellent a work, that to make and form her in time, it is requisite to use even the eternal premeditation and fore-counsel of God. 2. If we should suppose another impossibility, that God should not see ~~some~~ things that are very inconsiderable, or very distant, yet such is the magnitude of Mary, such the height and vastness of her merits, that he could not but reach her, and foreknow her at the distance of infinite ages." 3. He is much pleased with the doating conceit of Andreas Hierosolymitanus (*Serm. de Annunc.*), who salutes her by the name of Dioptra (which is the radius of an astrolabe with two sights, through which astronomers look, and measure the magnitude of distant things), which he thus applies: "God foresees and foreknows all that are predestinated, but Mary more especially, because through her (*tanquam per Dioptram*) he views and measures the greatness, height, and degrees of their sanctity. So that, as it is true, that all are elected and predestinated through Mary" (not chosen in him, it seems, as the Apostle speaks, Eph. i. 4, but in her), "so also it is true, that in that vast space of eternity, his sight reached all other just persons, because before them all he foreknew Mary.—Through Mary he viewed and measured the magnitude of Peter,† the height of Paul, &c. Because by the prayers of Mary they attained to the greatness of sanctity which God bestowed on them."

Upon ver. 25, "Before the mountains were settled, before the hills I was brought forth," thus he descants (*Ibid.* n. 317). "We may imagine the Divine Mind big with Mary and with all other creatures, yet they did not urge God to a birth,

* *Ibid.* n. 295, &c.

† So the Contemplations of H. Mary, p. 19. All saints and angels have their measures of glory set forth through a redundancy of hers, and in a subordinate proportion to hers.

since their creation might have been deferred to many ages: but Mary she pricked forward and urged so the Divine Mind, that being as it were impatient of such a conception, and that he might bring her forth in due time, he did anticipate many ages the creation of the world."

Upon ver. 30, "I was by him, as one brought up with him," V. Lat. *Cum eo eram, cuncta componens*, thus he discourses (n. 380, 381). "We may proclaim of the holy mother of God, that all creatures are as it were in her,—and they may all be glad that they are better in her than in themselves: for in themselves they are frail, and weak, and unstable; in Mary they are without all fault; and in short, though in themselves they cannot differ from themselves, yet being translated into her, then they are Mary, who is the noblest and highest under heaven. Therefore, when God would confer great honour and comeliness on his creatures, he would have her to consist of them all, *ut quemadmodum in ipso cuncta Deus erant, sic etiam in Mariâ cuncta Maria forent*; that, as in him all things were God, so also in Mary all things might be Mary. And a little after he calls her *Mundus Archetypus*, the archetype and original model, according to which the elements, consisting of contrary qualities, were fitted and married together, just as all passions and appetites were all at perfect accord, and made no rebellion in her.

Verse 30, "I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." Vulg. Lat. *Ludens coram eo*. Here we have such stuff as this, speaking in the person of Mary: * "When God made the world, and the things contained in it, and rejoicing, and, as it were, smiling, determined that they were good; then I also pleased him, and he smiled on me. For therefore he signified his approbation of them, because he knew they would be profitable and commodious to me; for, preferring me before all other men, he had respect chiefly to my profit and benefit." To which he adds again what he had said before, being hugely pleased with the conceit; "that contemplating all things in Mary, they pleased him better in her (being then all Mary) than in themselves." Then he goes on to tell us of several figures and shadows, such as the formation of Eve, the ark of Noah, &c. "which were preludes and sportful works of God, that went before that serious work of making her;† for when God earnestly desired to make Mary, and the disposition of

* Ibid. n. 416.

† Ibid. n. 418.

his eternal council required the deferring it some while, by such ways, *Longas moras ludendo fefellit*, God did sportfully drive away the time."

He adds another conceit, as derogatory to the work of our redemption, as the foregoing were to his creation.* "Whatsoever Christ did whilst he lived, whatsoever things he suffered whilst he looked upon other men, for whose sakes he laid out himself, they seemed to him difficult and hard; because he knew, that despising so great a benefit, they would be unthankful, and not use those blessings aright: but when he looked upon the Virgin, and beheld her grateful mind, and her diligence to make use of his merits, so as to reap abundantly the fruit of them; hence it was that Christ did as it were play with all that he did and suffered in the world; that is, he undertook them cheerfully and without difficulty."

We have seen how much they make us beholden to the blessed Virgin; for had it not been for her, Christ's undertaking might have stopped in the way for want of sufficient encouragement, and have come to nothing. But alas! this is a small matter, in compare with the last instance I shall give of this blasphemer's boldness, who makes even the whole Trinity to be beholden to her: for upon these words of the 23rd verse, "I was set up from everlasting" (Vulg. Lat. *Ab æterno ordinata sum*); he endeavours to make this plain, that she must needs be so ordained; for, says he, "there was a special reason why, as soon as ever the Divine Persons did eternally exist, they should have the Virgin in readiness; for, according to Hesy-chius,† the Virgin Mary was the completion of the whole Trinity:" for thus he says (comparing her and Noah's ark), "*Arca Noe tres contignationes habebat, hæc autem (sc. Maria) ὅλον τῆς τριάδος τὸ πλήρωμα*: that had three stories, and she *complementum totius Trinitatis*;" (which any one would translate thus), "She had (*ἐκέκτητο*, the word which went before) the whole fulness of the Trinity," that is, when Christ was in her womb; not as he would have it, she was the completion of the Trinity, for the explication immediately follows in Hesy-chius, "The Holy Ghost was her guest, the Father overshadowed her, and the Son dwelt in her, being carried in her womb:" (but the Jesuit is resolved to speak blasphemy when no occasion was given him, and thus he proceeds), "If the Virgin Mary does in some regards belong to the comple-

* Ibid. n. 419.

† Serm. de Laud. Mariæ, in Bibl. Patrum, tom. 2. Gr. Lat. p. 421.

tion of the Trinity, it could not be that the Trinity should sooner exist, than think of that which should complete it." He confesses it is difficult to conceive how the Trinity, which is most complete and absolute, should derive any fulness from a creature: yet this undertaker will try what he can make of it; and among his three ways of explaining it, the reader, I dare say, will have enough of the second, which therefore I shall only set down. It runs thus,* "The eternal Father does generate the Son, and communicates his essence to him; the Father and the Son breathe forth the Holy Ghost, and together with the essence communicate to him all its attributes: but now the Holy Ghost neither generates nor breathes another person: wherefore seeing the goodness of the Holy Ghost is equal to that of the Father and the Son, and the property of goodness is to set forth and communicate itself, thence it follows, according to our imperfect manner of conceiving, that something seems to be wanting in the Holy Ghost; for the other Persons do fill up the measure of goodness, but to the Spirit there wants a fourth person, into which it may pour out itself without measure: for though he does communicate himself, yet he does it very sparingly to the creatures and saints" (and he quite forgot Him to whom God gave the Spirit without measure, John iii. 34.) "This, therefore, one would desire, that he might communicate himself so largely to some one person, that if he cannot satiate his infinite longing perfectly, yet he may give it ease and relaxation. That this might not be wanting to the Trinity, and that the Holy Ghost might stay that longing, Mary is of set purpose ordered and committed to him, that so he might come upon her with a wonderful affluence of all his gifts," &c. And another blasphemer adds,† *Tanto ergo impetu spiritus sanctus supervenit in Virginem, ut quantum ipse valeat ostenderet.* Which I shall forbear to translate.

These are some of their lewd conceits for the advancement of the honour of the blessed Virgin. *Hæc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ.* The Socinians make good markets of such passages, by representing and reproaching them, as Crellius‡ takes notice of Corn. à Lapide's dedication of his Commentaries on the Minor Prophets, "To the holy uncreated Trinity, and created

* Ibid. n. 302.

† Phil. de Convelt. *Theatr. Excellent.* p. 67.

‡ De uno vero Deo, lib. 2. sec. 2. cap. 5.

in Christ Jesus." And an epistle attributed to And. Dudithius, at the end of Socinus's epistles,* cites the pages of the Polonian Missal, where they thus salute the blessed Virgin, *Ave, universæ Trinitatis mater* : " Hail, O mother of the whole Trinity." And Dudithius adds, " Now nothing hinders, but that leaving the Trinity, we fly to Mary herself, and implore her aid."

SECT. II.

The Legend of the Blessed Virgin's Parents, and of her Conception.

Anaph.†

" Pater præcelsæ Virginis Joachim erat nomine ;
Mater Anna nobilis, quæ regali fulsit semine :
In tres partes dividunt sic rerum substantiam,
Dant templo, dant pauperibus, servant sibi tertiam.

In 2do. Nocturn. Anaph.

" Annos quoque plurimos ducunt in conjugio,
Steriles et tristes, sub legis opprobrio :
Exprobravit hunc pontifex, Joachim quod sisteret
Infœcundus cum fœcundis, seque eis jungeret.
Joachim ex opprobrio in templo tristis exiit,
Nec ad domum vel uxorem, sed ad pastores transiit.

In 3tio. Nocturn. Anaph.

" Joachim et conjugii angelus apparuit,
Dolentesque nimium dulciter compescuit ;

" That Joachim begat the Virgin, it is agreed ;
Anne was her mother's name, derived from kingly seed ;
When into portions three their riches parted were,
The temple, poor, and they had all an equal share.

" These two in married state full many years did pass
Barren and comfortless, under the law's disgrace ;
The priest with scorn rejects his offerings as defiled,
Who with the fruitful dared to appear, and had no child.
With foul reproach dismayed, and from the temple sent,
He left his wife and home, and to his shepherds went.

" To this afflicted pair an angel then appears,
Whobadethemgrieve no more, but dry up all their tears ;

* In Biblioth. fratr. Polon. p. 512.

† Portifor. Sec. usum Sarum, Jul. 26.

Preces vestræ sunt acceptæ, habebitisque filiam,	God does accept your prayers, and you shall have a daughter,
Per quam Deus magnifice præstabit sanctis gratiam.	Through whom the saints shall gain abundant grace here- after.

Hymn.

Hornæ sec. usum Hierosol. Lugd. 1516.

"Fletus longævi Rex regum misertus, Angelum mittit, gaudium pro luctu, Ut dicat Annæ tempore senili,	"Their griefs prolong'd made Heaven at length relent, Which first to Anne this joy- ful message sent, Thou shalt conceive a child, thou that art old,
Prolem habebis.	An angel this foretold.
— Joachim magno gaudio repletur, Vocem dum audivit angeli di- centis,	Her husband Joachim greatly did rejoice, When after this he heard the angel's voice,
Pariet tibi Anna matrem Dei	Which said, that Anne God's mother should bring forth,
Grandem præcunctis."	Excelling all in worth."

Their English Festival (printed 1511) has given an account of this matter more at large, thus :* "The Virgin had a fader "that was called Jochym, that was so holy a man, that when "he was but fifteen yere of aeg, he departed all his goodes in "three partyes; and one partye he deled to wyddowes and "faderless chyldren; the second partye he gave to them that "were poor and nedy," (here he left out the temple, and made two of one,) "the third partye he kept to himself and to his "householde. And when that he was thirty-two yere of aeg, "for the great goodness of Anne he wedded her, and when "they were wedded they were togeder twenty-two yere: in "which tyme Anne never dyspleased him with no maner "thyng neither nyghte nor daye; for she was so gentyl to "him, and they bothe good and holy: yet God sent them "no fruyte of their bodyes, but were baraynes. Wherefore "they made a uowe to God, that if he wolde sende them a "chylde, they wolde offre it up to him into the temple for to serve God bothe nyghte and daye. Than on a daye as

* De Concept. Mariæ, fol. 62.

“ Jochym wente with his neybour to the temple for to do his
 “ offrynges, the byshop, that hyght Ysachar, rebuked him
 “ openly before all the people and sayd, Jochym, it falleth not
 “ for thee that is barayne and hast no fruyte to doo offrynges
 “ with other people, that God hath sent fruyte in Jherusalem.
 “ Than was Jochym sore dismayed and astonyed with this re-
 “ buke. Than he went home wepyng and took his shepherdes
 “ pryvely with his shepe, and went forth into a ferre countree
 “ amonge mountaynes and hylles, and purposed to have be
 “ there all his lyfe, and never more to come home to Anne his
 “ wyfe. Than when Jochym was gone, Anne was ryght sory
 “ and prayed to God and sayd, Lorde, that I am woe and full
 “ of sorowe, I am barayne and I may have no fruyte; and
 “ now moreover my husbande is gone away from me, and I
 “ know not whyder he is gone. Lorde have mercy on me,
 “ poore desolate creature. Than as she prayd thus, an
 “ aungell came downe and comforted her and sayd, Anne be
 “ of good comforte, for thou shalt have a chyld in thyn old
 “ aege, there was never noue lyke ne never shall be. Than
 “ was Anne aferde of this aungells wordes and of the syghte
 “ of him; and laye alwaye in her prayers as she had been
 “ deed. Than wente the same aungell to Jochym and sayd
 “ these wordes, and bade Jochym take a lambe and offre it in
 “ sacrifice to God, and soo he dyd. And when he had done so,
 “ from mydday till evensonge tyme he lay on the grounde in
 “ his prayers, thankynge God with all his herte. Than on the
 “ morrowe as the aungell badde he wente homewarde to Anne
 “ his wyfe with his shepe. And when he came nye home, the
 “ aungell came to Anne and badde her goo to the gate that
 “ was called the Golden Gate, and abyde her husbande tyll he
 “ came. Than was she gladde and toke her maydens with
 “ her and went to the gate, and there she met with Jochym
 “ and sayd: Lord I thank thee, for I was a wyddowe and
 “ now I am a wyfe; I was barayne and now I shall bere a
 “ chyld; I was woo and wepyng, and now I shall be in
 “ joye and lykyng: and soone after Anne conceived our
 “ Lady, and whan she was borne she was called Maria as the
 “ aungell badde before.”

REMARKS.

Although the Salisbury Portuise has given us, in the fore-
 going hymns, a short account of the parents and conception of

the Virgin in the legendary way, yet it is so ingenuous as to confess in another place,* that the book that treats of these is numbered by the Fathers among apocryphal writings, and therefore forbears to set down the lessons out of it. But what this has omitted, the old Roman Breviary (on the twentieth of March and twenty-sixth of July) has inserted; whose lessons are taken out of two spurious authors, *viz.* the Protevangelium of St. James, and the Epistle to Chromatius and Heliodorus, concerning the nativity of the blessed Virgin, falsely fathered upon St. Jerome, whom it cites.† And because these two are the shops from whence they fetch a great deal of their false wares, I shall here say a little concerning them. The learned Bishop Montague says,‡ not without great reason, “that both these books came originally from the Gnostics, but interlaced after them, and new varnished by the Manichees; among whom Seleucus was a great dealer in this trade.” Concerning the first of them (*viz.* Protevangelium Jacobi, published at Basil in the *Monumenta Patrum Orthodoxographa*), Bellarmine, in his Book of Ecclesiastical Writers says, “there is extant a Protevangelium under the name of James, but was never received by the Church.” If by the Church we understand that which is taught devotions, it must needs receive it, when the lessons taken out of it were publicly read to them to instruct them, as we find them in the Roman Breviary before cited: but if he means that part of the Church which censures authors, then indeed he says true that they never received it; but then the more horrid shame to suffer, nay, obtrude that upon the people which they censure and know to be false. Pope Innocent I.§ about the year 402, condemned this Gospel of James the Less, in his third epistle *ad Exuperium*. So does Gelasius after him in the first Roman Council:¶ “the Gospel under the name of James the Less is apocryphal.” And Baronius has taken such distaste at him,¶ that he has banished all consideration of him from his writings; and indeed every one that will vouchsafe to peruse him will justify his censure, and abhor the cheat. Neither need he be moved by what he finds cited out of this author, in the Hexaëmeron, set forth by Leo Allatius, A.D. 1629, under the name of Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, that

* In Fest. Concept. Mar. Dec. 8. Lect. 2.

† Brev. Rom. Antiq. ad 26. Jul. Lec. 3 et 6.

‡ Acts and Monu. c. 8. sec. 35.

§ V. Concil. Labbe, tom. 2. p. 1256. [Lut. Par. 1671.]

¶ Ibid. tom. 4. p. 1264.

¶ Appar. ad Annal. n. 39.

great father in the Council of Nice ; or, by what Allatius adds in his notes upon him, to gain him some credit ; for the testimonies of the ancients he produces, mention no work of his under the name of *Hexaëmeron* ; though St. Jerome, in *Catal. Scriptorum*, tells us of his book *De anima et de Engastrimurtho* against Origen and his epistles. And though Anastasius Sinaita (*Anagog. Contempl. in Hexaëm.* lib. 9, if they are his, which is doubted) cites words of Eustathius about the creation of birds and beasts, yet there are no such to be found in this which Allatius published ; who also in his notes confesses, that this book has the very same sentences and words that St. Basil uses upon the same argument, and that there was an Eustathius who did translate Basil's *Hexaëmeron* into Latin, which it is probable might give occasion to fix the name of the famous Eustathius to this work, who sure was a greater man than to believe such stuff as his Jacobus and ours relates, of the dove coming out of Joseph's rod at the espousals of the blessed Virgin, and of a mountain cleaving to receive and hide John the Baptist and his mother when Herod sought to kill him among the infants ; so far was he (as Allatius thinks) from leaving out and sifting the heretical and fabulous additions which our Protevangelium does abound with, and could not all of them be set down by him in that short account of the blessed Virgin's nativity, which he has extracted out of him.

As for the other, *viz.* the epistle, under the mask of St. Jerome, there is not one learned man of that Church that offers to defend it for his ; and but one Jesuit,* that I meet with, that is concerned to vindicate him for an author to be relied upon ; and I do not blame him for bearing him a kindness, because he has been beholden to him for a great deal that makes up his history of the blessed Virgin. He calls him a pious and ancient author : we may guess at his piety by endeavouring to impose upon the world under those great names, and by pretending that this account of the blessed Virgin was written in Hebrew by St. Matthew, and kept as a great secret, which he having met withal, desires him to translate. As for his antiquity, we shall grant that, seeing, as Sixtus Senensis says,† “ it contains those fictions of the Valentinians and Gnostics, which Irenæus and Epiphanius do confute.” Even he that is vouched for the author of the epistle, dares not vouch

* Christoph. à Castro Hist. Deiparæ in Catal. Auctor. p. 701.

† Bibl. Sanct. L. 2. tit. Matth. Evang.

for the truth of what he translates, only he thinks that it may read *salva fide et sine periculo animæ*, whether true or feigned; neither does he pretend strictly to translate, but that he will set down either what is there written, *aut consequenter scribi poterunt*, or might be written in consequence. So that the learned Gerh. Vossius might well say of it,* “though this impostor would seem to have made a translation out of the Hebrew, I fear he understood not Hebrew, and that he took his story either out of the book of the Gnostics, called *Stirps Mariæ*, or out of Seleucus’s book of the Nativity of Mary; and only passed over those things which patronized the Manichæan doctrine: for he commends Seleucus that he had spoken truly of the virtues and miracles of the Apostles, though he had told many falsities of their doctrine,” &c. He thinks it also probable, that by those writings under the name of Matthew, mentioned and condemned by Innocent, in his third epistle to Exuperius, are those which this counterfeit Jerome says he translated out of Matthew in Hebrew. And it is also likely that he is comprehended in that censure of Gelasius:† “all the books which Leucius the disciple of the devil made, are apocryphal” (for Leucius is the same with Seleucus, as learned men have shewn:‡ and, *Liber de Nativitate salvatoris et de Maria et obstetrice*, Apoc. “The Book of the Nativity of our Saviour, and of Mary, and the Midwife, Apocryphal.” Melch. Canus§ calls this epistle, *Fabulam insulsamquæ ac barbaram*; “an unsavoury and barbarous fable.” Baronius|| condemns him for an author unknown and unskilful, that knew not how to avoid manifest lies, as he instances in his making Isachar high-priest; whereas he shews out of Josephus, that there was none of that name about that time. And, to name no more, Bishop Montague,¶ after he has told the story of Joachim’s oblation at the temple, and Isachar’s disgraceful rebuking of him for his being childless (which we heard before) out of this author, he calls him impudent blasphemous impostor thus to babble, and gives many reasons for this sharp censure.** Yet this is he whom Xaverius, in his new Gospel, as well as the old Breviary, chooses to follow in most things

* Dissert. de Genere J. Christi, p. 34.

† Loc. ante citat.

‡ See Casaub. Exercit. 1. sec. 16. Bp. Montague’s Appar. 8. sec. 31.

§ Lib. 11. loc. com. c. 6.

|| Appar. ad Annal. n. 44.

¶ Acts and Monum. c. 8. p. 524.

** See his Apparatus, 8. sec. 51, 52, 53, where he answers Castro’s Defence of him.

concerning the blessed Virgin. But enough of these spurious authors. To return now to our remarks upon the foregoing history.

I will not make any dispute of it, that the names of the parents of the blessed Virgin were Joachim and Anna : neither will I urge that of St. Augustine "that her father was a priest of the tribe of Levi, named Joachim, because it is not canonical, it does not bind me ;"* because he seems rather to oppose his being of the tribe of Levi, as Faustus the Manichee held, than to doubt of his name ; especially since Epiphanius takes it for granted.† There is no mention of them in Scripture, unless Heli in St. Luke iii. 23, be the same with Joachim. Galatinus‡ cites his famous Rabbi Haccados, that he had two names, Heli and Joachim : but that author has been discarded by Baronius for a forged one,§ who pretends to write prophetically, in answer to several questions proposed by Antonius a Roman consul ; whereas no such name is to be found among the *fasti* of consuls at that time. Sanctius|| thinks that the Virgin's father was called Heliacim, or, which is the same, Heliyoacim ; and sometimes Heli, sometimes Joachim. Ger. Vossius,¶ that it is a contraction of Eliakim, and that Eliakin and Joakim are the same, as appears by 2 Kings xxiii. 34, and that the high priest, who is called Eliakim, Judith iv. 5, 11. (so it is in the vulgar Latin and Syriac) is called Joakim, Judith xv. 9. However this be, their own authors are not backward to grant that the Scripture is silent concerning them. Pet. Damianus** calls it a needless inquiry to ask who was the father or mother of the blessed Virgin, and a superfluous curiosity to seek after that which the Evangelist had not thought fit to tell us. Nay several†† of them draw a great mystery from it ; such as the Apostle does from Melchizedec's being without father and mother, and without descent, Heb. vii. 3, to signify that immortal Priest that should come after : so here, in her case, it denotes her freedom from original sin. "Who was her father and mother," says Novarinus, "is not told us in Scripture, as if she, the Virgin, had no parents ;"

* L. 23. cont. Faust. c. 9. ad fidem.

† Hæres. 78, et 79.

‡ Appar. n. 39.

¶ Ubi supra, p. 31.

†† Catharinus in c. 3. Genes. Novarinus umbr. Virg. p. 349. Carthagens de Arc. Doip. l. 2. hom. 2.

‡ De Arcan. l. 7. c. 12.

|| In Jerem. l. v. 3. n. 10.

** Lib. 3. de Nativ. Virg.

and in this regard she had none, "because she derived no spot or stain from them."

The legend makes her parents to be rich; Joachim was *πλούσιος, σφόδρα*, very wealthy, says the Protevangelium; and Xaverius* mentions their riches after him, and how they expended them by a threefold division, which Mantuan† has thus expressed.

"Sic nostras partimur opes; pars optima templo,
Altera sors inopi, servit pars tertia nobis."

That is,

"Into three parts our substance we divide,
The first and best we to the temple give;
The poor is by a second share supplied,
On the remainder we ourselves do live."

All which they borrowed from the counterfeit Jerome. And if they had told us of their low estate, *ταπεινώσις*, as the Scripture does of their daughter's, we had had as much reason to believe them. But since they also inform us how they laid it out, and into how many portions they divided it, I wonder they did not give us the particulars of Joachim's last will, which I do not find in any of them; for it had been as easy to have done the one as the other.

The same counterfeit has also told the story of their barrenness, and determines it to twenty years, in which time they fasted and prayed for a child with many tears, and vowed to consecrate it to God, if he would bestow one upon them. Poza‡ enlarges the time to about fifty years from their marriage; and yet their prayers and fastings must be continued, yea and pilgrimages too many times, and that barefoot (if we believe Vinc. Ferrerius),§ from Nazareth to Jerusalem, which the Breviary|| says was thirty-two miles. But fasting and prayers to obtain a child at this age seems to be not over-wise a business. Poza,¶ therefore, to free this from the imputation of folly, is fain to grant that it was a miracle they desired; but says they were put upon it "by divine inspiration, or perhaps they had the promise of a child by an angel's message." Having now bestowed this faith and patience upon them, the next work is to cry it up; as Poza** and others do, preferring Joachim's faith before that of Abraham, whom the Scripture calls the father

* Histor. Christ. p. 14.

‡ Elucid. l. 2. tr. 8. c. 1.

|| Ad Mart. 20. lec. 5.

** Novarinus. umbr. Virg. n. 1230.

† Parthen. Mar. l. 1.

§ Sermon. 2. de Nativ. B. Virg.

¶ Ibid. tract. 6. c. 2. p. 499.

of the faithful. "Behold here," says one, "a greater faith than in the conception of Isaac." But what talk we of Isaac, when that bold Jesuit* will have this conception of the blessed Virgin by two parents both barren, to be equally a rare thing in nature, as the conception of Christ himself of a woman without a man. Nay he goes farther,† that it was more wonderful than this, abstracting from Christ's divinity; for only *partes viri* were supplied in conceiving Christ; but two barren persons were supplied with strength in her conception. But no faith will be great enough to make the next passage to go for current with any intelligent reader, where both the fablers bring in Joachim rebuked and reproached by the high priest, and his oblation rejected: and what wot you was his crime? A new and strange one; that he had hitherto begot no child, taking it for granted, it seems, that it was his fault, which was a little severe; especially if Poza‡ has guessed right, that Anne laboured under a preternatural impotency, and that the marriage between her and Joachim was never consummated, nor her virginity lost, till the blessed Virgin was conceived; which, he says, is favoured by Germanus's words, "Immediately at God's command nature received seed, which it durst not do before the Divine grace was bestowed."§

Xaverius adds,|| that the priest, when he reproved him in indignation, told him for certain, that he was guilty of some secret pollution, which was the cause of his barrenness. One may well be tempted to inquire the name of this surly high priest, for he never had his fellow in story: but here the fore-named cheats are not agreed; for St. James's man calls him Reuben, and St. Jerome's Isachar; the old Roman Breviary¶ had so great a respect for them both, that it takes them both in, Isachar for the high priest, and Reuben for a scribe that assisted him. And they have also put a text in his mouth to confound poor Joachim withal. *Maledictus omnis qui non genuisset masculum in Israel*, "Cursed is he that hath not begot a male child in Israel." But, to see the good luck of it, both the curse and he that pronounces it are only of their own making, for there is no such high priest to be found at this time among the Jews; nor no such Scripture to be found in all the Bible. One would imagine that this bolt should have

* Poza, ib. l. 2. tract. 4. c. 1.

† Ibid. l. 2. tr. 2. c. 2, 3.

|| Ibid. p. 17.

† Ibid. c. 2.

§ Encom. de Virg. present.

¶ Ad Mart. 20. lec. 5.

done no execution : but they make Joachim just like one of their meek devotees at confession, trembling at the priest's anger, and not daring to dispute any of his sayings. He goes away confounded, and you find him presently at his penance, separating himself from his wife, and running into a desert, where he fasts forty days and forty nights :* or, if you will believe the Breviary,† almost five months in watching and fasting :—

————— “ Patriam fugiens ob dedecus urbem,
Rus coluit, pluresque latens inglorius annos
Duxerat in luctu tristem siue conjuge vitam.”‡

That is,

————— “ Disgraced he flies his native seat,
Choosing a country and obscure retreat :
Where many years he leads a pensive life,
As far removed from joy as from his wife.”

And you may well think that Anne must have her share too in this affliction ; she gives herself over to sorrow, and could hardly be persuaded by her maid Judith§ (for they know the names of all the family) to put on her best clothes upon a gaudy day. She cannot look upon a sparrow's nest, but it works upon her melancholy fancy, and she sighs and says, “οἱμοὶ ποῖα δὲ μήτρα ἐξέφυρέ με, Alas ! what womb bare me ? These birds are fruitful whilst I am barren,” &c. Nay such prayers this false Gospel and the later Greeks|| (such as Germanus¶ of Constantinople, who seems to have licked up his very drivel) have put into her mouth, as do not become a modest woman, and yet they bring her in praying ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ τῶν ἁγίων, “in the holy of holies” (as the history in Greg. Nyssen,** which he calls Apocryphal, does) whither never any such prayers, no nor any woman ever came.

But now it is high time to think of comforting them, and they have two angels ready if need be,†† though the epistler is contented with one ; but if we believe Pantalion, the deacon in Metaphrastes,‡‡ he is no ordinary one, but Gabriel the archangel ; with whom agrees St. Bridget,§§ who gives glory to the

* Protevang. Jacobi.

† Ibid. Lec. 6.

‡ Mantuan. Parth. Mar. l. 2.

§ Protevang. ibid.

|| Bp. Montague deservedly calls Cedrenus, Metaphrastes, Nicephorus, Germanus, Andreas (Cretensis vel Hierosol.) Scriptores stramentitii et quisquilæ quædam antiquitatis. Appar. 8. sect. 30. p. 299.

¶ In Encom. de Virg. præsentat.

** Orat. in Natal. Domini.

†† Protevang. Jac.

‡‡ In festo Mic. Archang.

§§ Orat. l. à deo revelat.

blessed Virgin for having her birth foretold by the same angel that brought the message to her concerning the birth of Christ. And that the mother and the Son may be as like as may be, Ludolfus de Saxonia* brings him in speaking just such words to Joachim as Gabriel did at the annunciation, *Ecce uxor tua pariet tibi filiam*, &c. "Behold thy wife shall bear a daughter, and thou shalt call her name Mary." They add also this farther prophecy of her by the angel,†, "That she should be consecrated to the Lord, according as they had vowed, and should be filled with the Holy Ghost from her mother's womb, and her conversation should be in the temple of the Lord." The same message, says Xaverius,‡ was carried by the angel to Anne; only he added those words to it, "Of this daughter of thine, Christ the Restorer of the world shall be born." But now to shew how these liars contradict themselves, this angel encourages him by the examples of Sarah and Rachel, of the other Anna, and the mother of Samson, who were all a long time childless, and tells him that *Peccati non naturæ ultor est Deus*,§ "God is the avenger of sin, not of natural defects," whom yet before this, the high priest had cursed out of the law for being barren. Here again one might be apt to wonder how such glorious and admirable passages concerning the parents of the blessed Virgin came to be passed over in silence by the Evangelists, which yet are now so particularly made known to the world: the answer is ready,|| "It was partly, lest the eyes of believers should be too much dazzled by so great a light; and partly, that something might always remain to re-create the declining world, and that the faithful by these, as by so many fresh dishes, might feed and nourish their devotion." So that now any tales will serve to refresh and entertain the old doating world; and if they be cloyed with the old Gospel, these cooks are ready at hand to serve up these new dishes, which no doubt will abundantly gratify and please them. But if this will not satisfy, there is another will shew you,¶ that all this was mystically foretold in the very first words of the Bible. "In the beginning God created the heaven and earth. That is, Joachim the father, and Anne, the mother of the blessed Virgin, for all things happened to

* De Vita Christ. part. 1. c. 2.

† See also Xaverius, Hist. Christ. p. 17.

‡ Ibid. p. 18.

§ Epist. ad Heliod. et Chromat. Xaverius. ibid.

|| Novarini umbr. Virg. n. 1201.

¶ Bernardin. de Bust. Marial. p. 2. Séi. 3.

them in a figure. The earth was empty and void, *i. e.* Anne was barren and unfruitful. And darkness was upon the face of the deep, *i. e.* the darkness of affliction and confusion was upon the face of Anne. And the Spirit of the Lord moved upon the waters, that is, upon the waters of her tears to comfort her. And he said, Let there be light, *i. e.* the blessed virgin."

Before the angel departed, the legend says he gave them this sign that his message was true, *viz.* that they should meet one another at the golden gate of Jerusalem. There, says the false gospeller,* Anne met Joachim, and hung about his neck, blessing God that she now was no longer a widow, but should conceive. Molanus† tells us of a picture in which was exhibited Joachim and Anne kissing one another at the golden gate, with this inscription, "*Taliter concepta est B. Maria ; thus was the blessed Virgin conceived.*" The like I have met with in the *Horæ* of the Carmelites, printed at Lyons, 1516, with a motto little different : "*Hic Joachim dato osculo Virginem Mariam ex Anna concepit ;* here Joachim by a kiss conceived the blessed Virgin of Anne." And Pelbartus‡ affirms, that this was the sense of some of the common people in his time. If the Jesuit Poza's forenamed rule were true, seeing it makes so apparently for the honour of the blessed Virgin, methinks this opinion should prevail ; but since the Fathers have overruled it (especially Epiphanius,§ calling it an "error of unhappy men ; for Mary is not God," says he, "nor received a body from heaven, but was begot of a man and woman"), however, they will consult her honour as far as they can in this matter, and yet avoid too that heresy, as Gononius|| calls it. The forenamed Jesuit¶ finds a comfortable mystery in it ; for asking the question, why the blessed Virgin was generated by a man and a woman, and did not come of a virgin ? one of his answers is, "that God took care hereby that Mary might be most dear to us, and therefore she was begotten of a man and woman, that she might more fully agree with us in the same nature," (by which reason, if God intended that Jesus should have been most dear to us, he should not have been born of the Virgin Mary). Others, that will grant her conception to have been after the conjugal commerce, yet

* Protevang. Jacob. p. 73.

† Lib. 4. Stellar. p. 2. art. 1.

|| Chronic. Deip. p. 2.

‡ Lib. 3. de Imag. c. 55.

§ Hæres. 79.

¶ Poza Elucid. l. 3. tr. 2. c. 1.

assert that it was without any motions of concupiscence: so another Jesuit,* "It is not to be said of the blessed Virgin that she was begotten by concupiscence, which signifies somewhat inordinate; for the use of matrimony, by which she was begotten, was most pure, and also without sin." So also St. Bridget,† "when it was foretold them by the angel, that they should beget a Virgin from whom the Saviour of the world should proceed, they would have chosen to die rather than join in carnal love, and all pleasure was dead in them:" and afterwards, "*contra voluptatem suam ex semine eorum per divinam charitatem caro mea compaginata est* ; by the divine love my flesh was compacted of their seed, contrary to their pleasure." This Galatinus‡ has explained more fully: "I confess," says he, "that St. Joachim and St. Anne did couple as man and wife, yet their ardent devotion and vehement contemplation (their minds being upon better things) did extinguish all bodily pleasure, all lust and concupiscence." Which a Jesuit§ has thus illustrated: "As Lot being drunk with wine, did not perceive when he lay with his daughters; so the parents of the most sacred Virgin, being inebriated with spiritual love, yet knowing well what they did (which makes it a special parallel) by a special privilege of God, they did not feel any unbridled pleasure of concupiscence, but begat her just as our first parents, if they had not sinned, would have procreated children in Paradise;" (for they know exactly how this matter would have been ordered there.)

If these have hit the mark, they must grant that St. Bernard was much mistaken, when he says,|| "*Quomodo peccatum non fuit, ubi libido non defuit, &c.* How could her conception be without sin, when it was not without lust? unless we say that she was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and not by man." The secret of this fancy, is only to avoid a saying or two of St. Augustine's:¶ "Believe firmly, and in no wise doubt, that every one that is conceived by the commixture of man and woman, is born with original sin, subject to death," &c. Which because he was unwilling to grant of

* Jac. Granado immac. concep. B. Virg. p. 111.

† Revel. l. 1. c. 19. (vel. 9)

‡ De Arcan. l. 7. c. 8.

§ Spinellus Mar. Deip. c. 18. p. 240.

|| Epist. 174, ad Canon. Lugd.

¶ Or Fulgentius lib. de Fide ad Petrum, p. l. qu. 24. so also l. 1. de Nupt. et Concupis. c. 24. Ex concupiscentia carnis quæcunque nascitur proles originali est obligata peccato.

the blessed Virgin, Galatinus restrains it thus, "he that is generated *per concubitum, cum corporis libidine et voluptate*, where the parents have had pleasure;" which is as wise a reasoning, as if when one had made this a rule, "that whatsoever is nourished will at length be corrupted and die;" another should put in this exception, "yes, if it eats its meat with pleasure," otherwise it is not necessary. But we have not yet done with their conceits about her formation. Many will have her body to be formed and animated differently from other conceptions, which they say ordinarily in females is eighty days after the man has known his wife. St. Amideus's revelations* say, "that the soul was infused into the body of the blessed Virgin six hours after the use of matrimony by her parents, her flesh (which was unusual) being in that short space of time formed and figured." Bapt. Poza† is peremptory, "that she had no part of her body which was not completely perfect on the first day of her conception, so that she might have been fed at the mouth, and have beheld the common light:" only he is put to it, to resolve without a miracle (since she might have been born the same day she was conceived) how she could have been suckled, if she had then been born; since according to Fienus a human body, when it is first quickened in the womb, does not much exceed the bigness of a barley-corn, or as others, of a young bee; and it is hard in such a small body to imagine how the mouth can receive and draw the mother's breasts; and it would be to no purpose to trouble you with his foolish resolution. But if you ask again, what end this invention of her momentaneous formation serves? Though he conceals, I think, one reason, which is a thing mainly intended by them, to make every thing almost in her to answer what was done in our Saviour, whose body the schoolmen‡ generally make to have been formed in its several parts at once, and at the same instant animated and united to the Divinity; yet he discovers another mystery, and he will quickly resolve you,§ "That this did that for her, which

* Apud Th. Raynaud. Dipt. Marian. p. 22.

† Elucidar. l. 3. tract. 3. c. 1, &c.

‡ See Aquinas, 3 part. qu. 33. art. 1, 2. Becanus Sum. Theol. part. 3. tract. 1. c. 5. qu. 2. Estius in 3 lib. sent. dist. 2. sect. 6. Greg. de Valentia, tom. 4. disp. 1. qu. 6. punc. 1. Greg. Gallicanus says the same after them, Corpus Christi in instanti fuit formatum perfecte in parva quantitate sicut una apis. Marial. p. 165.

§ Elucid. l. 2. tract. 5. c. 2.

Christ's being born of a Virgin did for him, *viz.* made her not guilty of original sin, because not included in the covenant with Adam, her conception not being ordinary, but miraculous." Nay he goes so far as to assert, that by reason of this miraculous formation, "she was excused *à debito originalis peccati*, from being liable to original sin," as well as from the sin itself. As wisely also, in another place, he concludes,* "that although no violence was done to the blessed Virgin when she was made of the female sex, yet considering the perfection of her soul and body, it was a miracle that she was not a man rather than a woman, since all the wonderful productions mentioned in the Scripture, that sprang of barren and effete parents, were all males."

We are told by Ægid. Gelenius,† of a great rarity shewn at Colen, *viz.* some remains of the place (I suppose of the dust or earth) where the blessed Virgin was conceived. And Xaverius has given us another discovery,‡ and I think none has prevented him herein, that St. Anne conceived the blessed Virgin upon a Thursday.

But all this refers to her body, and if there should be nothing rare and extraordinary said of her soul, this better part would bear no proportion with the other: but they have taken care that it shall have no reason to complain; though we have, for obtruding upon us such raw and indigested fancies.

We all know that our reason comes very slowly upon us, and that the first life we live is merely animal: our understanding begins to dawn a little like the first peep of day, some while after we are born, and so proceeds by an imperceptible progress, as light does, till we arrive at our noon, which is very late. But in her, they tell us, it was quite otherwise; *Nescit tarda molimina*, &c. Her understanding is anticipated,§ and they give her the use of her reason in the first moment of her being;|| she had the use of free will and perfect light in her mind, says St. Bernardine,¶ even in her mother's womb; so that she could from the first moment exercise supernatural acts both of knowledge and faith;** and by this use of her reason she disposed herself to all that grace that she received in her first sanctification; just as the schoolmen say, that the

* Ibid. tract. 7. c. 1.

† De Colon. Magnit. p. 266.

‡ Hist. Christi, p. 18.

§ Vinc. Bruni Med. de B. Virg. p. 74.

|| Raynaudus, ibid. p. 158.

¶ De Concep. Virg. Serm. 4. art. 1. c. 2.

** Raynaud. ib. p. 159.

angels disposed themselves to all that grace in which they were created : for her sanctification was not in the way that other infants are sanctified,* only by the infusion and reception of habitual grace, but *instar adulti*, like one of age, by her own proper act of conversion to God, proceeding from the assistance of divine grace. Only here is a great doubt, whether this use of reason was granted as a privilege to the blessed Virgin, only for that moment of her first justification and conception, as Vasquez speaks,† and then ceased till she came at the ordinary time to find it again, as some infants have by a wonder spoke once and no more in their infancy : this he says, indeed, was Cajetan's opinion ; but it seems more probable, "that the blessed Virgin, from the instant of her conception, and so forward, all the time of her infancy (without interruption), had the full use of her reason, at least in those things that appertained to God and virtue : having an uninterrupted influence (says our late Contemplator)‡ of actual graces so quickening her great soul, that no one moment of her life, from the first conception of her soul, was vacant from divine contemplations, heavenly affections and ecstasies of supernatural love ;" or as he more fantastically expresses it elsewhere,§ she, "from the first positive instant of the infusion of her soul, ever exercised the most sublime operations of the contemplative and unitive life, without recourse to the images of imagination or dependence on sense.—Her great soul was so completely actuated, even in the womb of her mother, that her contemplations, sallies of love, and unions with God were restless ; ever increasing in their vigour, and still expatiating through the vast motives and methods of mystical love." Nay, she was, says another,|| "in such perpetual contemplation of God and divine things, that she was never so busied or so fast asleep, but she directed her mind towards God, and thought of him ; so that in this respect she was in the state of the blessed (*per beatiss.*)" If you have a mind to understand this still more particularly, the Contemplator¶ tells us, that "by the help of abstractive lights divinely infused, were represented first, 1. The several essences, attributes and motions of the whole body of the creation, in their several degrees and stations ; 2. The

* Vasquez. in 3 part. tom. 2. qu. 27. art. 6. c. 3, 4. [Venet. 1610.]

† Ibid. c. 4.

‡ Contempl. L. et. Gl. of H. Mary, p. 20.

§ Ibid. p. 45.

|| Novarini Ueber. Virg. n. 1323.

¶ Ibid. p. 45.

divinity of God, with its manifold emanations, operations, and inexplicable comprehensions; and, 3. The humanity of Jesus, with all the orders of grace, mysteries of salvation, and ecstatic loves of the saints." But St. Bernardine* informs us of seven things, that, according to some, she understood perfectly in her first sanctification (*viz.* in her mother's womb). "1. Irrational created nature. 2. Rational created nature. 3. Spiritual created nature. 4. Divine uncreated nature. 4. All things that were to be avoided. 6. All things to be followed and embraced. 7. After what manner and to what degree all things were to be hated or loved." He that could believe all this, might well add, "that she was (when imprisoned in the womb) in a more sublime state of contemplation, than any human creature ever was in its perfect age; and though she slept in her mother's womb as other infants do, yet sleep did not effect that in her it does in us, for in us it buries the acts of reason and free will, and by consequence acts of merit; but I believe her soul, by free and meritorious acting, did then tend unto God, so that she did more perfectly contemplate when she slept, than any others ever did when they were awake." The Jesuit Poza† tells us of Fr. Ximenes, a patriarch of Jerusalem, who has given an account of some of her sorrowful thoughts, and also joyful reflections she made in her mother's womb. St. Bernardine‡ seems to have been almost as skilful as the other, for he says, the "impetus (force) of her first sanctification did impel the mind of the blessed Virgin to desire the incarnation of the Son of God out of fervent charity for the salvation of all the elect." Her charity they also equalise in this state to her knowledge; for thus they sing of her in the hours § of her immaculate conception.

<p>" In conceptione, charitate ignita, Draconis potestas est à te contrita."</p>	<p>" When first conceiv'd, with love inflam'd, By thee the dragon's power was maim'd."</p>
--	--

"She began to love God," says another,|| "from the very first instant of her conception, and never ceased to do so afterwards, never intermitted (as he explains it) the most fervent act of charity." If he had said this of the habit that it never

* Loc. ante citat.

† Loc. citat.

|| Novarinus, *ibid.* p. 89. n. 296.

‡ Elucidar. lib. 2. tract. 15. cap. 4.

§ Litanie variæ. Colon. 1643. p. 226.

ceased, it might have better passed; but understanding it of the act, as he does, it is impossible to be true of any one that lives in flesh. But what we think impossible, they say nobody need doubt of, as in this that follows, which concerns the measure of that grace she had in the first moment again of her conception, which, we are told,* was more copious and intense than that which angels and men attain to in their consummation; which is admirably proved by that of the Psalmist, Ps. lxxxvii. "The Lord loveth the gates of Sion,"† that is, the conception of the Virgin, "more than all the dwellings of Jacob;" that is, more than other saints.

The reader, I daresay, by this time, is past all hopes of guessing to what pitch his faith is to be screwed up in matters that concern the blessed Virgin. When I met with a Jesuit ‡ asserting, "that the oldest saint in this life never attained so great a measure of grace as was infused into her when she first began to live," I was ready to think that he would make a bold attempt that would carry the matter higher: for though another§ indeed was so great a lunatic as to call her *Antiqua dierum*, the Ancient of Days, a title given by the prophet Daniel to God himself; yet his reason for it was but the same; "because she in her mother's womb was filled with wisdom, prudence, understanding, and the rest of the gifts of the divine Spirit, above all the most aged." But to tell us, that then her grace exceeded the measures of angels and of saints consummate in bliss, is such wild divinity as one would scarce look to meet with anywhere, unless from him that for half an hour together cries, Glory, glory in Bethlehem.

One would wonder whence this fancy concerning her, of reasoning in her mother's womb, and having such contemplations there, should arise. The only acknowledged reason of it is, that many authors|| have attributed this to John the Baptist, when he leaped in his mother's womb; which they would have to proceed from the use of his reason, and a gift of prophecy, conferred on him at the presence of our Saviour (which I will not now debate, because we shall have occasion to consider it under another head, when we speak of her visi-

* Raynaudus, *ibid.* p. 159. et Illeph. Giron in *promptuar. conc.* p. 60.

† Spinellus, *ib.* c. 7. p. 115.

‡ Sherlog. *Anteloq.* 8. in *Cantic.* sec. 1.

§ Max. Sandæus in *Luna mystic.* p. 52.

|| See Vasquez, *loc. citat.* qu. 27. art. 6. c. 3. [Venet. 1610.]

tation of Elizabeth), and it is not fit that any saint should outgo her in any privilege.

Another reason they reserve as a secret, though I doubt not but it is intended in all these assertions, *viz.* the making her in every thing that is possible like unto Christ himself; that so when their lines run so parallel, they may the more plausibly call her a helper, a co-worker, a co-redeemer, or whatever other name they use, to signify how much we are engaged to her in promoting our salvation.

This therefore being the common opinion of the schoolmen (as Estius * attests), that "Christ merited from the beginning (*i. e.* from his first conception) by the actual use of free will," which supposes the use of his reason; they have given the same to her: though there was a time when this was denied her, even by him who is not sparing in his grants to her; I mean Aquinas:† "*Non statim habuit usum liberi arbitrii adhuc in ventre matris existens, hoc est speciale privilegium Christi:* He held it to be a special privilege of Christ to have the use of free will in the womb, and not to be affirmed of her." But now Christ must be contented to part with some of this prerogative, as they make him resign a share in many a privilege, for the pleasing and honouring of his mother, as we shall find it in the very next thing that follows.

SECT. III.

Of the Blessed Virgin's Conception being Immaculate.

Though the pretended infallible chair has not thought fit as yet to determine the controversy about the immaculate conception, for reasons we shall after give (which have no relation at all to piety, but to craft and cunning, lest the breach about it in their own Church should be made wider), yet, however, it has given them leave to *pray* that, which it dare not command them to *believe* as an article of faith. Almost every Church is furnished with offices to that purpose; some of which I shall here set down, beginning with our own Church.

I find in an old Primer of Salisbury (fol. 127), the hours of the conception of the blessed Virgin, wherein this is plainly asserted against all opposers.

* In Lib. 3. Sent. dist. 18. sec. 1. See also Aquinas, p. 3. qu. 34. art. 2, 3. [Colon. 1662.]

† Part. 3. qu. 27. art. 3. [Ibid.]

Ad Matutinum. Hymnus.

Benedicta conceptio Virginis matris Mariæ	Let every place that serves the King of Glory,
Festivetur cum gaudio, adsit dies lætitiæ :	Observe a feast and keep an holiday
Lætetur tota regio serviens regi gloriæ,	For the conception of the Vir- gin Mary,
Non obstante objurgio detra- hentis invidiæ.	Howe'er detracting envy may gainsay.

Oremus.

Deus, qui pro salute hu-
mani generis carnem gloriosæ
Virginis Mariæ assumere dig-
natus es, et ipsam sine macula in
concipiendam ante sæcula in
matrem præelegisti; concede
propitius, ut qui de ejus con-
ceptione (quæ fuit nostræ re-
demptionis, necnon temporum
plenitudinis exordium) læta-
mur, ejus piis intercessionibus
ab instantibus periculis et à
morte perpetua liberemur, &c.

Let us pray.

God, who for the salva-
tion of mankind didst vouch-
safe to assume the flesh of the
glorious Virgin Mary, and be-
fore all ages didst pre-elect her
for thy mother to be conceived
without spot: mercifully grant,
that we who rejoice in her
conception (which was the be-
ginning of our redemption,
and also of the fulness of times)
by her pious intercessions may
be delivered from present dan-
gers, and from everlasting
death, &c.

Ad primum.

Erubescant insensati qui re-
spuunt celebrare
Mysteria tam sacrati diei et
festivare ;
Quo anno fuerunt copulati vir
cum sua muliere,
Pessimè sunt advisati sic vo-
lentes deviare.

Hymn.

Shame on those senseless
persons that refuse
This high day's mysteries to
celebrate ;
When she conceived was by
marriage use,
They're ill-advis'd that thus
will deviate.

Vers. In conspectu altissimi
immaculata permansisti.

Vers. Thou didst remain im-
maculate in the sight of the
Most High.

Resp. Dei genetrix, intercede
pro nobis.

Ans. O Mother of God in-
tercede for us.

Ad Tertiam. Hymn.

Conceptio mirabilis ab Angelo
nunciata,
Maria tam laudabilis in con-
ceptu præservata,
Est unde venerabilis Ecclesia
illustrata,
Et in suis miraculis et laudibus
honorata.

An angel brings the news of
her conception,
So wond'rously secur'd from
sin's infection :
The Church that hence derives
illustrious rays,
Strives to proclaim her mira-
cles and praise.

Ad Sextam. Hymn.

Ave Regina cœlorum, inter
omnes mitissima ;
Ave decus angelorum, inter
omnes pulcherrima,
Simul et archangelorum Œmni
laude dignissima,
Quæ concepta vitiorum siue
labe purissima.

Hail, Queen of Heaven, yet
mild beyond compare ;
Hail ornament of angels, none
so fair :
Worthy the praise of an arch-
angel's strain,
Whose pure conception was
without all stain.

Ad Nonam. Hymn.

Quum corpus et viscera quæ
dominum portaverunt,
Virginalia ubera quæ ipsum
met lactaverunt
Beata sunt et opera tua, et
qui crediderunt
Quod sine labe concepta post
et ante remanserunt.

Since that the womb that bare
our Lord, the breast
That gave him suck, and all
thy works are blest ;
They're blest too, that believe
thee without stain
Conceiv'd, an ever-virgin to
remain.

Ad Vesperas. Hymn.

Salve Mater salutaris, quæ es
soror insignita,
Salve quia Deum paris ange-
lorum spes et vita,
Salve Virgo singularis verè
sacra margarita,
Salve quia stella maris es sine
labe concepta.

Hail saving mother and our
sister too,
God's mother, angel's life,
and hope art thou ;
Hail sacred pearl, thou Virgin
singular,
Conceived without all spot,
the sea's bright star.

Ad Completorium. Hymn.

Matris Dei conceptio est nos-
træ redemptionis
Potissima inceptio atque re-
parationis,
VOL. XV.

When first God's mother was
conceived, began
The reparation of lost man ;

Et non mirum : exemptio	Sin'sold contagion first escap'd
antiquæ contagionis	our nature,
Fuit et in principio ipsius	When she began to be a crea-
creationis.	ture.

Before these Hours is a picture of God the Father, speaking these words to the blessed Virgin: *Tota pulchra es, amica mea, et non est macula in te*: "Thou art wholly fair, my love, and there is no spot in thee."

I find another office of her immaculate conception in several books,* out of which I shall set down a few passages.

Ad Matutinm. Hymn.

Ab æterno Dominus te præor-
dinavit
Matrem unigeniti Verbi, quo
creavit
Terram, pontum, æthera : Te
pulchram ornavit
Sibi sponsam, in qua Adam
non peccavit.

Before the world thou wast
design'd to be
The mother of that Word, by
whom the sea,
The earth and heavens were
made : He beautified
Thee for his spouse, and in
this fairest bride
Adam ne'er sinn'd, although
in all beside.

Oremus.

Sancta Maria, regina cœ-
lorum, mater Domini nostri
Jesu Christi, et mundi domina,
quæ nullum derelinquis et
nullum despicias ; respice me
domina clementer oculo pie-
tatis. et impetra mihi apud
tuum dilectum filium cuncto-
rum veniam peccatorum : Ut
qui nunc sanctam tuam con-
ceptionem devotó affectu re-
colo, æternæ in futurum beati-
tudinis bravium capiam, ipso
quem virgo peperisti donante
Domino nostro Jesu Christo,
qui cum Patre, &c.

Let us pray.

O holy Mary, the Queen of
heaven, the mother of our
Lord Jesus Christ, and Lady
of the world, who neither for-
sakest nor despisest any one ;
look upon me, gracious lady,
with an eye of pity, and ob-
tain for me, of thy beloved
Son, pardon of all my sins :
That so I, who now remember
thy holy conception with de-
vout affection, may hereafter
receive the reward of eternal
felicity, by the donation of
him, whom thou, remaining a
Virgin, didst bring forth, our
Lord Jesus Christ, who with
the Father, &c.

* *Litanie variæ*, Colon. 1643. p. 221. *L'Office Divin* Paris. 1658.
Heures dediees au Roy. Paris. 1662.

Ad Primam. Hymn.

Salve Virgo sapiens, domus
Deo dicata,
Columna septemplici men-
saque exornata ;
Ab omni contagio mundi præ-
servata,
Ante sancta in utero parentis
quàm nata.

Wise Virgin hail, God's holy
house thou art,
Seven pillars and a table thee
adorn ;
The world's contagion ne'er
defil'd thy heart,
Cleans'd in thy mother's
womb, whilst yet unborn.

Ad Tertiam. Hymn.

Salve arca fœderis, thronus
Salomonis,
Arcus pulcher ætheris, rubus
visionis :
Virga frondens germinis, vellus
Gideonis,
Porta clausa numinis, favusque
Samsonis.
Decebat tam nobilem Natum
præcavere
Ab originali labe matris Evæ

Almam, quam elegerat, gene-
tricem verè
Nulli prorsus sinens culpæ
subjacere.

Hail saving ark, and throne of
Solomon,
Hail heaven's fair rainbow,
bush of vision,
Thou budding rod and fleece of
Gideon,
God's gate ne'er opened, Sam-
son's honey-comb.
'Twas fit a Son so noble should
obtain
Freedom from mother Eve's
original stain,
For her whom we God's mo-
ther truly call,
Nor leave her under any sin
to fall.

Ad Sextam. Hymn.

Salve Virgo puerpera, templum
Trinitatis,
Angelorum gaudium, cella
puritatis,
Solamen mœrentium, hortus
voluptatis,
Palma patientiæ, cedrus casti-
tatis,
Terra es benedicta et sacerdo-
talis,
Sancta et immunis culpæ ori-
ginalis.

Hail Virgin mother, house
o'th' Trinity,
Delight of angels, cell of
purity,
The mourner's joy, cedar of
continence,
Garden of pleasure, palm of
patience,
Blest ground, like that which
to the priests did fall,
Holy and free from sin ori-
ginal.

Antiph. Hæc est virga in

Antiph. This is the rod, in

qua nec nodus originalis, nec cortex actualis culpæ fuit.

*Vers.** In conceptione tua, Virgo immaculata fuisti.

Resp. Ora pro nobis patrem cujus filium peperisti.

Oratio.

Deus qui per immaculatam Virginis conceptionem, dignum Filio tuo habitaculum præparasti, quæsumus, ut sicut ex morte ejusdem Filii tui prævisâ eam ab omni labe præservasti, ita nos quoque mundos ejus intercessione ad te pervenire concedas,

Per eundem Dominum.

which was neither the knot of original, nor bark of actual sin.

Vers. O Virgin, in thy conception thou wast immaculate.

Resp. Pray for us to the Father, whose Son thou broughtest forth.

A Prayer.

O God, who by the immaculate conception of the Virgin, didst prepare a fitting lodging for thy Son, we pray thee, that as by the foreseen death of that Son of thine, thou didst preserve her free from all stain, so grant, that we being cleansed, may come to thee by her intercession,

Through the same Lord.

This prayer is still owned by the Church, for it is in the Missal of Clement VIII. (Paris. 1625.) among the proper offices granted to the Franciscans; where the first office is for the feast of the immaculate conception, and there we meet with *Deus qui immaculatam*, &c. We are told in a Rubric (*Litan. variae*, p. 230.) that the foregoing antiphona and prayer were approved by Pope Paul V., who granted to those that should recite them indulgences of a hundred days. They remain also among the proper offices for the order of the Holy Trinity, printed at Lisbon, 1621, called *Officium immaculatae Conceptionis Virginis Mariæ in Sabbato*, where I meet with several strains worth the noting, of which take these following:—

Invitatorium.

Immaculatam conceptionem Virginis Mariæ celebremus: Christum ejus præservatorem adoremus Dominum.

Anaph. Fortitudo et decor indumentum ejus; byssus et purpura vestis illius.

Let us celebrate the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and adore the Lord Christ her preserver.

Anaph. Strength and beauty are her clothing; her garment is fine linen and purple.

Vers. Liberaſti me Domine
ex ore leonis.

Resp. Et à cornibus uni-
cornium humilitatem meam.

Anaph.

Aquæ multæ non potuerunt
extinguere charitatem; nec
flumina peccatorum obruent
Mariam.

Vers. Eruisti à frameâ,
Deus, animam meam.

Resp. Et de manu canis
unicam matrem meam.

After the 5th Lesson.

Resp. Fac tibi arcam de lig-
nis levigatis, ruptæque sunt
abyssi magnæ, et factum est
diluvium peccati super omnem
terram.

Vers. Arca vero deifera ele-
vata est in sublime, et fere-
batur super aquas; opertique
sunt omnes montes excelsi
sanctorum.

After the 6th Lesson.

Resp. Fiat mihi sanctuarium
et habitabo in medio eorum.
Arcam de lignis Sethim com-
pingite, et deaurabis eam auro
mundissimo intus et foris, &c.

Vers. Inspice, et fac secun-
dum exemplar quod tibi in
monte monstratum est.

Ad Laudes. Anaph.

Domum tuam decet sancti-
tudo, Domine, in longitudine
dierum.

Vers. Thou hast delivered
me from the lion's mouth.

Resp. And my only mother
from the horns of the unicorns.
(To these they compare ori-
ginal sin.)

Anaph.

Many waters could not
quench charity; nor floods of
sin overwhelm Mary.

Vers. Thou hast delivered
my soul from the sword.

Resp. And my only mother
from the power of the dog.

Resp. Make thee an ark of
planed boards, and the great
abysses were broken up, and
there was a deluge of sin upon
all the earth.

Vers. But the ark in which
God was carried was lifted up
on high, and borne upon the
waters, and all the high moun-
tains of the saints were co-
vered.

Resp. Make me a sanctuary
and I will dwell in the midst of
them. Make an ark of shi-
tim wood, and thou shalt gild
it within and without with pure
gold, &c.

Vers. Behold it, and make
it after the pattern that was
shewed thee in the mount

Anaph.

Holiness, O Lord, becometh
thine house for ever.

Anaph.

Hæc est domus Domini firmiter ædificata, benè fundata est super firmam petram.

Anaph.

Fundavit eam altissimus, qui super maria fundavit eam, et super flumina præparavit illam.

Anaph.

Dominus custodit te ab omni malo, Maria, custodivit animam tuam, introitum tuum et exitum in sæculum.

Vers. Non accedet ad te malum.

Resp. Neque flagellum appropinquabit tabernaculo tuo.

Anaph.

Quam pulchraes, amica mea, columba mea, et odor vestimentorum tuorum super omnia aromata.

Vers. Dominus est in loco sancto isto, et ego nesciebam.

Resp. Non est hic aliud, nisi domus Dei et porta cæli.

I find a prayer in the Hours of Sarum, wherein her freedom from original sin is expressed, and a most encouraging indulgence annexed in the rubric before it; which is this:

“Alexander the VIth, Pope of Rome, hath granted to all “them that say this prayer devoutly in the worship of St. Anna, “and our Lady, and her Son Jesus, ten thousand yeres of “pardon for deedly sinnes, and twenty yeres for venial sinnes “*toties quoties.*”

Oratio.

Ave Maria, gratia plena, dominus tecum, tua gratia sit mecum. Benedicta tu in mulieribus; et benedicta sit sancta

Anaph.

This is the firm-built house of the Lord, and it is well founded upon a sure rock.

Anaph.

The Most High hath founded her, who hath founded her upon the seas, and prepared her upon the floods.

Anaph.

O Mary, the Lord keepeth thee from all evil, he hath kept thy soul, thy going in and thy coming out for ever.

Vers. No evil shall approach thee.

Resp. Nor any scourge come nigh to thy tabernacle.

Anaph.

How fair art thou, my love, my dove, my undefiled one, the smell of thy vestments is above all spices.

Vers. The Lord is in that holy place, and I knew it not.

Resp. This is nothing else but the house of God, and the gate of heaven.

The Prayer.

Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou amongst women; and blessed be St. Anne thy mo-

Anna mater tua, ex qua sine
macula et peccato processisti
Virgo Maria; ex te autem na-
tus est Jesus Christus Filius
Dei vivi. Amen.

ther, from whom thou Virgin
Mary didst proceed without
spot and sin; and of thee was
born Jesus Christ, the Son of
the living God. Amen.

Many instances of the like kind may be seen in Balengem's
Parnassus Marianus, where several hymns are collected out of
divers Missals and Breviaries.

She is called

Cella plena vino mero,*

Granum sine palea.

Virgo non inficitur,†

Cum à matre concipitur,“

Originali crimine.

Tu à Deo fabricata,

In conceptu præservata

Nulla trahis scelera.

De mulierum numero hæc sola
præservata‡

Fuit matris in utero sancta
absque labe nata.

Oratio. §

Deus ineffabilis misericor-
diæ, qui primæ piacula mu-
lieris per Virginem expianda
sanxisti, da nobis quæsumus
ejus memoriam digne venerari,
quæ unigenitum tuum Virgo
concepit, et Virgo peperit Do-
minum nostrum Jesum Chris-
tum filium tuum.

A cellar filled with unmixed
wine,

Pure grain without chaff.

The Virgin was not infected
with original sin, when her
mother conceived her.

Thou wast framed by God,
preserved in thy conception,
contracting no sin.

'Mong women, none but she
the favour gain'd,

To be conceived pure, and born
unstain'd.

The Prayer.

O God of unspeakable mer-
cy, who hast ordained that the
first transgression of the wo-
man should be expiated by a
virgin; grant us, we pray thee,
worthily to venerate her me-
mory; who, being a virgin,
did conceive thy only begotten
Son, and remaining a virgin
did bring forth our Lord Jesus
Christ.

There also you find the blessed Virgin included in a *Gloria
Patri*.

Gloria Patri genitæque proli,
Flamini Sancto, Virginique
Matri,

Glory be to the Father, Son,
and Holy Ghost; and perpet-
tual praise to the Virgin mo-

* Ibid. p. 4.

† P. 24, 25.

‡ P. 377.

§ Horæ sec. usum Hieros. de Concept. et Hortulus animæ, p. 81.

Quæ Dei natum genuit hominem,
Sit laus perennis. Amen *

ther, of whom the Son of God was born a man. Amen.

The present Roman Breviaries, though they are not so express in the point of immaculateness, yet are full of other unwarrantable applications.

*Oratio.**

Familis tuis quæsumus Domine cœlestis gratiæ munus impartire; ut quibus Beatæ Virginis partus extitit salutis exordium, conceptionis ejus votiva solemnitas pacis tribuat incrementum,

Per Dominum, &c.

A Prayer.

Lord, we beseech thee bestow upon thy servants the gift of heavenly grace, that they to whom the birth of the Virgin was the beginning of salvation, the vowed solemnity of her conception may contribute to the increase of their peace,

Through our Lord, &c.

Lect. 1. Ecclus. 24.

Ex ore Altissimi prodivi, primogenita ante omnem creaturam, ego feci, &c.

Lesson 1.

I came out of the mouth of the Most High, the first-born of every creature, &c.

Lect. 2.

Ab initio et ante sæcula creata sum, et usque ad futurum sæculum non desinam, et in habitatione sancta coram ipso ministravi, &c.

Lesson 2.

From the beginning, and before all ages I was created, and I shall never fail; in the holy habitation I ministered before him, &c.

Lect. 3.

Ego mater pulchræ dilectionis et timoris et agnitionis et sanctæ spei. In me gratia omnis viæ et veritatis; in me omnis spes vitæ et virtutis. Transite ad me omnes qui concupiscitis me, et à generationibus meis implemini.

Lesson 3.

I am the mother of fair love and fear, and knowledge, and holy hope. In me is the grace of every way and truth; in me is all the hope of life and virtue. Come unto me all ye that are desirous of me, and from my offspring ye shall be filled.

Qui audit me non confundetur, et qui operantur in me

He that heareth me shall not be confounded, and they

non peccabunt, qui elucidant that work by me shall not do
me, vitam æternam habebunt. amiss; they that brighten me
● shall have eternal life.

REMARKS.

There is no controversy ever was started, that has more busied the wits of those of the Roman communion, nor any that ever was managed with greater heats and animosities in their schools, than this of the Immaculate Conception. A question that never entered into the heads of any of the ancient Fathers; for, as Vasquez* confesses, "it is manifest, that before the times of St. Bernard, there was no dispute among the ancient Fathers concerning the blessed Virgin's preservation from original sin, since none of them so much as mention it: though in his time it appears, by his 174th epistle to the canons of Lyons, there was some debate about it among divines." I shall make bold to add, that this controversy betwixt the two parties (they who assert her conception in original sin, whom we shall call, to avoid circumlocution, Maculists, and those who deny it the Immaculists), is not only late and novel, but also extremely foolish and ridiculous, when you consider where the difference lies betwixt them. They themselves confess,† that it is agreed on all hands in their Church, that she was sanctified in her mother's womb before she was born; so that the only question (and it is a very wise one) is, "whether in the first moment of her conception she was immaculate, yea or no?"‡ Both parties agreeing, that she had the use of her reason (as we heard before) in the first moment of her conception; one might have been tempted to think, considering the zeal of the opposite side, that the Maculists had brought her in loaded and labouring for some months together in her mother's womb, under a sense of God's heavy displeasure for Adam's sin, which the other side could not endure to suppose, and that this made them so very angry. But there is no such matter, I assure you; they are as civil to the blessed Virgin in this respect as one can possibly desire.

* Part. 3. disp. 117. c. 1.

† Vasquez, ib. qu. 27. disp. 114. c. 1. [Venet. 1610.] et Bellarm. de Amiss. Gratia, l. 4. c. 15.

‡ Th. Raynaudus Dipt. Mar. p. 132.

For one of their adversaries* has given us an account of three opinions among them, and all of them very favourable to her. The severest is that of St. Thomas, "who thinks that she was in sin for a time (but so short a time that none can measure it), to wit, so much time as intervenes between two moments (*inter duo instantia*); for in the first instant of her conception she contracted the original stain; in the next moment after it she was purged from it; so that she was obnoxious to sin only the time that must come between those two moments. Others think that the blessed Virgin was a whole moment of time in sin (*integralis temporis instanti*), but all the time that is coupled with that instant, was in grace, and so grant that her Son delivered his mother from guilt, as soon as it was possible for Divine Omnipotency to effect it." This will not please the Immaculists; for this reason, because if they say that the first instant she was in sin, though they grant that in the next instant grace was infused to take it away; yet because two instants (according to the philosopher, 6 Physic.) cannot immediately cohere (no more than two atoms in continued quantity) without a middle time between them, therefore the blessed Virgin must be in sin according to this opinion, not only the first instant, but also the time between that and the second. But he says there are a third sort (and they are the very pinks of courtesy) who come thus far as to say, "that in the first instant in which she contracted guilt, she was also delivered from the same by God; only they crave leave to divide an instant into three (*in tria signa*). In the first of which she contracted sin; in the second sanctifying grace was infused into her soul, but more incomplete and transient, abiding with sin, but ready to expel it: in the third the same grace is understood as permanent, and actually to have expelled sin." This indeed is too subtle to be intelligible, yet however one would think it should be kindly taken by those of the other opinion; since, if they will but allow them the third part of a moment for her stay under the original guilt, they then declare her to be as immaculate as the other can imagine her to be. And if the one party apprehends a wound to be given to the honour of the blessed Virgin, by the supposition of her being under that sin, it is healed, you see, by the other in far less time than the twinkling of an eye, or the quickness of swiftest thought. And yet after all, I assure you, it is morally certain that these

* Franciscus à Christo. prælect. de Incarnat. fol. 189.

two parties will never be pieced together, but eternally quarrel. Fresh combatants appear every day upon the stage, and they charge one another so furiously, and engage the people in such numbers in the quarrel, that neither General Council nor Pope (whom both sides acknowledge only capable of doing it), dare decide this doughty matter, for fear of worse consequences to ensue thereupon. So that all things considered, never was a juster censure than that severe one, which a poet of their own has passed upon them both.*

————— “*Dux veniunt ista in certamina sectæ
Nonnunquam magno implentes subsellia risu.
Æquanimis autem volumus si vera fateri,
Vanus uterque labor, pietas temeraria, præceps
Religio, levitas velata scientiæ amictu.
Nec Natura potest illuc extendere visum,
Nec Deus hoc docuit, nec re dependet ab ista
Nostra salus quæ nos igitur dementia torquet,
Ut studeamus in his consumere litibus annos.*”

That is,

“*Whilst these two sects in furious combats chase,
Their pleased spectators only louder laugh :
For if we'll freely say the truth, 'tis plain
Their piety is rash, both strive in vain :
All the religious zeal they seem t' express,
Is only folly clothed in skilful dress.
Nature's short sight cannot so far extend,
What God ne'er taught, on that can ne'er depend
Our happiness : what madness then t' engage,
Or in such fruitless quarrel spend our age ?*”

Since therefore we are made spectators of this combat, and need not, as they have stated the question, trouble ourselves much about it ; it may not be amiss to take a view, how they have listed themselves, and with what weapons offensive and defensive they come appointed into the field.

The Maculists, though their infantry be not so numerous, yet they are no ways daunted, as having, they judge, a better cause, and more experienced leaders† and old commanders on their side. The Fathers (though you take St. Bernard into the number) are wholly theirs ;‡ so are also the most ancient

* Mantuan. in S. Fest. Decembr.

† Two hundred and sixty famous Doctors are named, and their words cited by Vinc. de Bandelis in tract. de sing. purit. et prærog. concept. J. Christi.

‡ M. Canus Loc. Theo. l. 7. c. 1. Sancti omnes uno ore asseverant, &c. So Pet. Cellensis, Sententiæ omnium retro Sanctorum. Lib. 6. Epist. 23.

schoolmen and those of greatest note. They think they are sure of the Master of the Sentences,* and their claim is not questioned to the great Albertus, and Alexander Alensis, to Bonaventure, Durandus, St. Antoninus, and a little army of other chieftains mentioned by Vasquez † But there are two especially whom they glory in, and who spirit the whole party, the one a schoolman, and the other a father. Aquinas‡ of the first sort, with his vast train of Thomists, must needs make a formidable appearance to the enemy, when they cannot deny that Christ gave approbation to his writings, in that famed saying, *Bene de me scripsisti, Thoma*, "Thomas, thou hast written well of me." And that evasion is only to be laughed at, which a Jesuit,§ being sensible of the force of it, has given; *Forte dixit de me*, &c. "Perhaps he said on purpose those words, 'of me,' by way of restriction and limitation, lest any one should take occasion to think that Christ approved whatsoever he wrote of Mary." The Father I mentioned is St. Augustine,|| who may well stand for a great many, because in his writings against the Pelagians, he had occasion particularly to take notice of it, and always resolves it the same way, making it the privilege of Christ only to have no original sin, but involving his mother by name in it. To mention a few of the places. In his fifth book against Julianus¶ thus he says, *Quod si dementis est dicere, et sine dubio caro Christi non est caro peccati, sed similis carni peccati*, &c. "If it be undoubted madness to affirm the contrary, that Christ's flesh is not sinful flesh, but like to sinful flesh, what can we conceive farther, but that, excepting this, all other human flesh is of sin? And hence it appears that that concupiscence by which Christ would not be conceived, did cause in mankind an evil offspring; and although the body of Mary came from thence, yet she did not transmit it into the body which she did not conceive from thence. Now from hence it is that the body of Christ is said to be in the likeness of sinful flesh, because all other flesh of men is sinful. Whoso denies this, and so compares the flesh of Christ with the flesh of other men that are born, as to assert that both are of equal purity, he is found to be a detestable heretic." And elsewhere,** *Virginis caro etiamsi de peccati*

* Estius, l. 3. dist. 3. sect. 3.

† Ibid. disp. 117. c. 1.

‡ Part. 3. qu. 27. art. 2. in corp. et ad 2, 3 et 4.

§ Barth. de Scobar. conc. 1. de concept. B. Virg. p. 27.

|| Fourteen places are cited out of him by Bandelis, lib. citat. part. 1. c. 9.

¶ C. 9.

** De Genes. ad lit. l. 10. c. 18.

propagatione venit, &c. "The flesh of the Virgin, though it came of a sinful stock, yet she did not conceive (Christ) from the stock of sin.—Therefore the body of Christ, though it was assumed from the flesh of a woman, who was conceived of that stock of sinful flesh, yet because his body was not conceived in her, as she was conceived, neither was his flesh sinful flesh, but the likeness of sinful flesh." In another place,* *Solus ergo ille homo factus manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam, nec sumpsit carnem peccati, quamvis de natura carnis peccati (alia Lect. Quamvis de materna carne peccati), i. e.* "Therefore he alone, who remaining God was made man, had never any sin, nor did he take sinful flesh, though it was of the nature of sinful flesh (or, though it was of his mother's sinful flesh)." And again,† *Maria ex Adam mortua*, &c. "Mary deriving from Adam, died because of sin : Adam died because of sin, and the flesh of our Lord, derived from Mary, died to take away sin."

St. Bernard also speaks the same sense in his words which were cited before. If their adversaries were not convinced that the ancient Church knew no such doctrine, they need not trouble themselves to give an account, as they do,‡ why this was kept a secret in former ages, and why God did hide the mystery of the immaculate conception from them. The reason of this is worth setting down, as well as the confession of the novelty of the opinion. *Non pauci homines rudes, etc.* "The rude and vulgar sort of people, if they had found for certain that the blessed Virgin had never contracted original sin, would have been apt to have committed a mistake, and thought her to have been a goddess. For if the inhabitants of Melita, when they saw the viper fastening on St. Paul's hand, and yet neither biting him nor vomiting any poison upon him, cried out that he was a god ; how much more easily would unlearned men, when they saw that the viper of original sin had envenomed all the children of Adam, and that it had not touched her, have concluded that she was a goddess?" By which admirable reason, God must be supposed to keep it as a secret still, for there are rude and unlearned people still, in as much danger as ever of this, or rather more ; for even in the days of Epiphanius, when the Collyridians venerated her, she was

* De Peccat. merit. et remis. l. 2. c. 24.

† In Psal. 34. conc. 2.

‡ Carthagera de Arcan. Deip. l. 1. hom. 4.

not magnified, nor her privileges manifested near so much as now.

From all which it appears, that the Maculists' opinion has the advantage of prescription and immemorial possession, if they are sufficiently provided to keep and maintain it. And here too they question not their furniture,

————— “ Habent quo se tueantur, et olim
Ista hominum communis erat sententia.”*

That is,

‘ They plead the ancient Church’s common sense,
And store of arguments for its defence.’

The sacred writings secure their title, and they produce them with more advantage than their adversaries ; they can flourish sometimes in a Scripture allegory indeed, and tell the Immaculists, that *tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi* ; † “ darkness was upon the face of the abyss,” to signify that she was conceived in sin ; yet this is needless, when so many places in their plain and literal sense, offer themselves to their service : such as these ; “ All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” ‡ “ As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” § “ The Scripture hath concluded all under sin.” || “ He gave himself a ransom for all.” ¶ “ If Christ died for all, then are all dead,” &c.** Where the antecedent being universal, the consequent must be so too. From these, and such like texts, they have raised several strong arguments : as, 1. That it is a bold presumption, when the Scripture so plainly involves all under sin that derived from Adam in the way of ordinary generation, to make an exception in her case, who so derives, without the least countenance from it. Besides, 2. Redemption and salvation by Christ is declared there to be as general and universal as sin and death by Adam : and the blessed Virgin rejoices in God her Saviour, but all these suppose sin : and therefore Christ is called our Saviour and hers, “ because he saves his people from their sins.” And in her case it must be from original sin, because the Maculists, as well as their adversaries, grant, that she was guilty of no actual sin : and there are few of them that will assert with

* Mantuan. parthen. Mar. 1.

† Rich. à S. Laurentio

‡ Rom. iii. 23.

§ Rom. v. 12.

|| Gal. iii. 22.

¶ 1 Tim. ii. 6.

** 2 Cor. v. 14.

Cardinal Cusanus,* “that the Virgin needed no Redeemer to absolve her from the sentence against Adam and his posterity, to which she was never subject. That she alone, after the fall of Adam, never stood in want, but was created full of original righteousness, as Eve was, and much more; just as Christ, according to his human nature, was created in all fulness of righteousness much more than Adam.” To talk of a preservative redemption from the sin she might have incurred,† is to say that Christ was the redeemer of angels; and if Bellarmine’s answer be allowed,‡ *Dicimus ei remissa fuisse peccata, non in quæ inciderat, sed in quæ incidisset, nisi gratia Dei per merita Christi præventa fuisset*: “Her sins were remitted, not those which she had committed, but which she might have committed, if not prevented by God’s grace through Christ’s merits.” You may as well say of the blessed angels (which yet was never heard of) that they had their sins forgiven; for if it had not been for God’s grace, they also might have fallen into sin. And Christ might be said to shed his blood for them too, if the Jesuit Coster says right,§ “that Christ did not purge her soul from sin by his blood, *sed mundam præservavit*, but preserved it clean.”

Antiquity never understood these distinctions, and the former Popes were against them. So Zosimus,|| *Nullus nisi qui peccati servus est, liber efficitur, nec redemptus dici potest, nisi qui verè per peccatum fuerit ante captivus, etc.* “No person is made free by Christ, who was not before a servant of sin, nor can be said to be redeemed, unless he were a captive.” So also Pope Leo says,¶ “As he found none free from guilt, so he came to free all men from it.” 3. They urge also, that according to the sentence upon all that derived from Adam, she suffered the punishments which were the effect of it, and was subject to calamities and death, therefore it must be granted that the cause of these must have place in her, to wit, original sin; especially since the second Council of Aurance against the Pelagians (Can. 2.) defined it to be affixing injustice to God, to say that by one man death passed upon all mankind and not sin. 4. Lastly, They think they have an advantage over their adversaries by this question, what if the

* Exercit. 1. 8.

† Scotus in 3 dist. qu. 1.

‡ De Amiss. grat. 1. 4. c. 16.

§ Medit. de B. Virg. p. 76.

|| Apud Augustin. Epist. 157. ad Optatum.

¶ Sicut nullum à reatu liberum reperit, ita pro liberandis omnibus venit. Serm. 1. de Nat. Christ.

blessed Virgin had died before our Saviour's passion? (for it is apparently foolish to say, as Galatinus does,* that it was impossible that the mother of the Messias should die before her Son :) now if she had died before him, and had had no sin, she should not have gone to purgatory, but must have been received into heaven; and then this absurdity would follow, that the kingdom of heaven was opened before Christ had overcome the sharpness of death.

Thus I have given an account, in some particulars, what the Maculists have to plead for themselves. And I shall pass over, and not urge the revelations of St. Catharine, since they do not seem to need them; nor the argument from miracles, since though they have tried them (to be even with their opponents), yet they are not so skilful in this trade, but have come off very ill in the attempt, as appears by the history of the friars at Berne, A.D. 1509.

And now it is time to turn our discourse to their adversaries, and to take a view also of their strength.

The whole stream of antiquity running so clearly in the former channel, and the Scriptures also so plainly making way for it, it cannot well be thought that any one man should boldly undertake to stem this tide. And indeed he that first appeared of any note, to give a stop to the former prevailing opinion, was Scotus, the subtle schoolman:† but you may plainly perceive that he had no assurance of the cause he had undertaken by his timorous proceeding; for he acknowledges that the Maculists' opinion was the common one; and having added three other possible ones, he adds, *Quod horum trium est factum, Deus novit*: "God knows which of these had place in the case of the blessed Virgin." And again: "If it be not repugnant to the authority of the Church or of the Scripture, it seems probable that what is most excellent may be attributed to Mary." His scholars have taken more heart, and are more positive than their master, especially since the Franciscans and the Jesuits have both entirely espoused this opinion, and stand up stiffly in maintenance of it: and the pretence of the excellency and honour of the Virgin Mary has so far charmed the body of this Church, that now all the people almost are devoted to it who would be accounted pious; and though one might have expected some concern for our Saviour, who once had no compeer in this privilege of the immaculate

* L. 7. de Arcan. c. 10.

† In 3 lib. Sent. distinc. 3.

conception, but was accounted the only Holy One of God in this respect; yet now the case is altered, and piety is measured more by the honour given to the mother than to the Son of God himself, insomuch as now in all their books, this has the name of the "pious opinion," though the impiety of it was demonstrated sufficiently in six arguments by a sturdy champion on the opposite side. Nay,* they fancy strongly that Christ himself is pleased when she, in this or any other way, is advanced, as their Mautuan,† speaking of the Immaculists' opinion, has expressed it.

"Sed prior, ut nobis æquum videtur,
Dignior est, et grata magis nato atque parenti."

That is,

"This speaks her worth and honour more than t'other,
And better pleases both the Son and mother."

Even the other sex is^{***} engaged on this side, being made to believe that the contrary injures the mother of God: and in a revengeful zeal we are told,‡ that the women of Mantua refused to give a piece of bread or any alms to the Maculists, unless they asked in honour of the immaculate conception, or renounced the contrary opinion (which was as troublesome an objection as a begging friar could well meet with), so that now this novelty gets ground every day of the other opinion, which as the same poet says,§

"Jam senio exsanguis fricens, sua robora sensim
Perdit, et amissa jam majestate recedit
Sponte sua ———"

That is,

"Now chill'd with age, its strength and beauty lost,
It lies as if 'twere giving up the ghost."

The wonder is the greater when we find that their arms, by which these feats are done, are all bulrushes, and their arguments above measure trifling and childish.

There is not one place of Scripture (as was observed before) which, in the literal sense, can be produced to countenance it. Bellarmine himself tells us,|| "We must not look for an express text in this matter:" for it is resolved that this case must never be determined, but, like a tennis-ball, must be tossed up and

* Bandelis, loc. citat. p. 1. c. 34, 35, etc. † Ibid. lib. 1.

‡ Bernardinus de Busto. Marial. Serm. 9. p. 103.

§ Mantuan. ibid.

|| De amiss. grat. 1. 4. c. 15.

down, and banded from one side to the other, to the world's end, as if that Church wanted some toy to entertain it, and to play withal. And indeed it is pretty to observe how sportfully figures and allegories, and texts out of the Canticles, are applied to her by way of accommodation (such as those the office of the immaculate conception abounds with, of her soul being delivered from the lion, and the power of the dog, and the horns of the unicorn, &c.) Here now, by the help of a little fancy, any place almost will be made to chime to this tune. The formation of Adam* out of the earth that was not yet cursed, shews that the blessed Virgin, of whom the second Adam was formed, was not under the curse, because without all sin. Paradise† is a type of it, which in its first plantation had nothing that grew there hurtful or deadly. Eve that was given to Adam, and made a help-meet for him (*Vulg. Lat. adjutorium simile sibi*), denoted that the blessed Virgin, whom God gave to Christ, to be *adjutorium nostræ salutis*,‡ the helper of our salvation, was to be *similis ei*, like to him, without sin. The ark of Noah carried above the waters, tells you, that she was preserved from the deluge of original sin that overflowed the rest of mankind. The ark of the testament, made of Shittim wood, which was *imputribilis*, had no worm or rottenness in it, and in which the pot of manna was laid up; how plainly does it shew§ that she that in her womb was to receive Christ, the heavenly manna, was not obnoxious to the corruption of any sin. The ivory throne of Solomon, 1 Kings x. overlaid with the best gold, was a figure|| of her bright and pure soul not sullied with any sin. Who also was like his temple in the building of it, 1 Kings vi. neither smitten with the hammer of original, nor wounded¶ with the axe, or any other tool of actual sin. The gate that Ezekiel saw, cap. xlv. 2, "that was shut and never should be opened," it is agreed,** prefigured her, and tells us that all sin was barred out; and "no man should enter in by it;" therefore original sin was prevented, else the devil, which is worse, would have entered in: but the Psalmist says, Psal. cxlvii. that "God had strengthened the bars of thy gates." And thou art that city of which the prophet says, Isa. xxxvii. "He shall not

* Bellarm. *ibid.*

† Gr. de Valentia, tom 4. disp. 2. qu. 1. punc. 2.

‡ Bernard. de Busto. serm. 5. p. 58.

§ Greg. de Valentia, *ibid.*

¶ Bern. de Bust. *ib.* serm. 6. p. 64.

|| Coster. *Medit.* 1. p. 19.

** *Id. ib.* p. 66.

come into it, nor shoot an arrow there ;” * that is, God did not permit him to wound thee with the dart of original sin. The characters which Solomon gives of the spouse, their Church has applied to her, and they argue the same. For “she is among the daughters as the lily among the thorns,” † Cant. ii. “Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot in thee,” ‡ Cant. iv. Which we are told § were the words of Alex. Ales, which he spake when dying to the Virgin, commending by her his soul to God. *Tota pulchra es, amica mea, et nulla macula neque originalis neque actualis est in te* : “Thou art beautiful, comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army with banners,” Cant. vi. “My dove, my undefiled is but one. The daughters saw her and blessed her,” *ibid.* “Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun,” &c.

Their adversaries perhaps will say, that these texts rather agree to her after-sanctification, than to her first conception : but Jac. de Valentia has one place in reserve, which he thinks comes home to the point, Psal. xlv. 5, *Adjuvabit eam Deus manè diluculo* : “God shall help her, and that right early.” It had not been early enough, if she had sinned in Adam before she was sanctified.

Thus we have seen as remarkable a verification as can any where be met with, of that usual reproach they cast upon the Scripture, that it may be made a nose of wax to bend and stand any way. I suppose they would not think it safe to use the laws of the land in this manner ; but according to their principles, they may make bolder with God Almighty and his oracles ; for this is but a small matter, for their patroness to obtain pardon for an abuse of Scripture, when one that sealed a writing, giving his soul to the devil to enjoy a wench, || and another that denied Christ himself in such another bargain with the devil to get an estate, ¶ yet both of them were secured and forgiven, by applying themselves to the blessed Virgin.

As for their arguments from reason, they are of the same strain with the former, very witty and very ridiculous. The chief argument that Bellarmine ** and most of the schoolmen

* Spinellus de thron. dei, c. 7. p. 115.

† See Delrio's Florida Mariana, orat. 1. applying this to her.

‡ Bellarm. et Greg. de Valentia, ubi supra.

§ Pelbartus, l. 4. Stellar. p. 1. art. 3.

|| Tursellinus in Hist. Lauret. lib. 3. c. 33.

¶ Cæsarius, l. 2. exempl. c. 12. et Vinc. Belluar. spec. Hist. l. 7. c. 105, 10.

** Loc. ante citat.

insist on, is this : "That it being certain that God could have preserved her from this guilt, the only reason why he should not, must be because he would not do it." And here they undertake a pretty hard task, as well as a very saucy one, to determine what is decent and fitting for God to will in this case, when he has not declared one syllable concerning it. God be thanked that he has told us what he himself thought was fitting with reference to our Saviour, otherwise these reasoners would undoubtedly have concluded, that it was no decent preparation for the coming of the Son of God into the world to lie in a cratch, nor for his going out of it to hang upon a cross. "But God's thoughts are not like ours, nor his ways like our ways," Isa. lv.

But let us hear their proofs, such as they are.

1. Some urge,* that it was most fitting God should do this in respect of the mother, for if she had been obnoxious to sin, she had not been *idonea mater Dei*, "a fit mother of God." Rupertus has been so bold before them to assert, "that it was requisite she should be sanctified;" that is, cleansed from all sin, both actual and original, that so Christ that was born of her might be altogether holy : though I find one Jesuit† so ingenuous as to profess, that his sanctity did not at all depend upon hers. Here again their faucies work amain. "It is altogether fitting and becoming God's wisdom (says Gab. Biel‡), that the immaculate Lamb of God should proceed from one that was immaculate; and if so in body, why not rather so in soul?" "Christ would sit (says another§) upon the foal of an ass on which no man had sate before, and would lie in a sepulchre in which no man had lain; so also take flesh of a Virgin, where the devil had never sate, and in whose soul sin had never dwelt. If the host|| should fall into stinking mire, or into the mouth of a mad dog, or a swine, who would consecrate it into

* Francisc. à Christo, ubi supra.

† Raynaudus, ibid. p. 215, says, *Quamvis Mater Christi sorduisset peccato, Christus ex ea nasci potuisset, neque tamen minus sanctus fuisset quam nunc sit, quia sanctificatio orta ex unione ad verbum, et fons secundariæ sanctitatis Christo communicatæ, fuit independens à sanctitate Matris.*

‡ In Fest. Concept. serm 3. § Bernar. de Bust. serm. 8. p. 86.

|| Idem. serm 9. p. 99. Si in aliquo calice semel stercoreizatum fuisset, licet postea purificatus esset, non tamen honestum esset in eo consecrare SS. sanguinem Donini nostri J. Christi; sic indecens fuisset in muliere in qua semel Diabolus peccati stercore projecisset, dei filium procreari.—Christus noluit acceptare in matrem, nec Deus pater in conjugem.

the body of Christ? So absurd would it be, if of her that had rolled in the filth of sin, and been worried in the mouth of a stinking devil (*fœtentis Diaboli*), the most pure body of our Saviour should have been formed."

A Maculist may easily with one breath blow away all these pretty similitudes, like so many bubbles; for it is to be hoped, that in spite of original sin and the devil, one that is guilty of it, if no other sin intervenes, may still be a true and pure Virgin; and then the sanctification of her soul being supposed, the Son of God resolving to be made flesh, need no more abhor this Virgin's womb, than the Holy Ghost does the bodies of those that have been very impure, after they are washed and sanctified; so far from it, that he vouchsafes to dwell there, and they become his temple.

2. Others insist much upon the virulency of original sin,* which Raynaudus says always seemed to him to be the strongest argument: for this is a mortal sin, and makes a man a child of wrath, and the devil's slave; by reason of this an infant is a monster in that rank of beings that is destined to a supernatural end. It seems clear therefore that original sin, which has so frightful and horrid a form, had no place in her; for so the throne of God would have become the seat of the devil. "If she had been conceived under this guilt (says another†) she had been more punished in that instant than all the creatures in the world; for all of them put together could not have attained to her merits and reward, all which spiritual good things by this means she must lose, though she only was disposed to receive them: so that considering how great this punishment would be to her, one may say that she must be more hated of God for that time than Cain or Judas, or any other of the damned;" nay, says another,‡ "it would have more displeased her to have been sullied and defiled with this stain, than to have been damned or annihilated."

3. But if all this will not do, they have the reserve of a bold charge against the Son of God himself. "For since Christ could easily have preserved her immaculate, if he would not do it (says Bernardine), it must needs be confessed, that he was not a good son to his mother."§ Or, as a nephew of the

* Raynaud. *ibid.* p. 145, et plerique alii.

† Bernar. de Bust. *ib.* serm. 7. p. 74.

‡ Novarinus umbr. *Virg.* p. 65. n. 207.

§ Greg. de Valent. *ib.* arg. 8. Bern. de Busto. *Marial.* serm. 1. p. 16.

Soldan urged it,* “Christ loved his mother more, and did more for her than my father did for me; but my father on my birth-day made me free, as much as was in his power: but if Christ, who foresaw the damage and evils which by original sin would befall his mother, would not prevent it, he had sinned against the command of the law of honouring father and mother, and had been *impius filius et ingratus*, a wicked and ungrateful son.”† This, besides the blasphemy of it, is a very foolish assertion; for, by the same reason of honouring his parents, they might have required that none of his race and genealogy should ever have been stained with any crime: that no blot should have lain upon Judah for incest, nor upon Rahab for being an harlot, and especially not upon David, who son he is called, for being an adulterer. But these saucy prescribers of what is becoming to our Saviour, would do well to remember how he turned upon Peter, with a “Get thee behind me, Satan,” for words of his that savoured more of God and less of men, than these of theirs do.

4. That no blot may be left unhit, a Jesuit‡ conceives he has spied a weak place, an easiness and tenderness of nature in his adversaries in matters that concern the honour of the blessed Virgin, and he resolves to work upon it. He tells them, that though their opinion be not heretical, nor contains mortal sin in the holding of it; yet it gives just occasion of offence to the blessed Virgin, so that they may well expect she should be less favourable and propitious to them, which, says he, “they ought extremely to dread.” Now that so it is, is plain by this instance. Suppose a controversy depended before a judge concerning the nobility of a person, which though the judge did not absolutely define, yet if he declared that it was very probable that he was a noble person, and he should take it more kindly, if he were accounted and treated as such; would it not be sufficient cause of distaste, if he to whom the judge had been so favourable, could not obtain that honour which he so encouraged? This is the blessed Virgin’s case exactly; every one has liberty given him by the Church to think thus honourably of her; and the Church has encouraged the paying of it by spiritual indulgences; and has not the

* Idem, *ibid.* serm. 6. p. 65.

† See late Contemplations, p. 30, harping upon this, that Christ would honour his divine mother, even for example sake, in doing that he requires of all, &c.

‡ Greg. de Valentia, *ib.*

blessed Virgin reason then to be somewhat displeased and angry with those that still deny it?

5. I shall add but one argument more, which another Jesuit* has advanced upon the principles owned by the Maculists themselves, and let them look to it how they will answer it, for it need trouble none else besides, *viz.* she must be free from original sin, otherwise she was guilty of actual sin; which he thus proves. It is, *de fide*, an article of faith, that the blessed Virgin had no actual sin, no not the lightest and most venial.† The adversaries also grant, that she had the use of her reason the first moment of her being, and that whosoever is endued with it, is obliged in the first dawning of reason to subject himself to God by an act of love towards him above all, or else he contracts a grievous guilt. Wherefore unless the blessed Virgin in the first moment of the use of her reason (that is, of her being) had offered herself to God by a perfect act of love, she had incurred actual sin. If she did exert such a perfect act of love to God, it is plain by that act sanctifying grace was conveyed. Therefore she was freed from original sin. I leave them to squabble it out, for I am afraid it will not be answered in haste.

But if the Maculists seem to have lost any ground by their own unwary concessions, in the next thing I am sure they will recover a great deal more, and put their opponents so hard to it,‡ that they must quit one of their strongest holds, and it is well if they can any way save their honour; I mean in the point of antiquity, and the judgment of the Fathers. I know the Immaculists are not wanting to bring in their lists, and make a show of Fathers, as Salazar has done in his book of the Immaculate Conception; yet every one that will take the pains to examine them may see with half an eye, that most of those they produce speak nothing to the purpose, and those that seem to do so are testimonies out of false and spurious writings. This the Jesuit Salmeron§ being aware of, has taken another course, which is indeed more ingenuous, but I doubt they will conn him no thanks for it; seeing he has discoursed in this

* Raynaudus Diptyc. Mar. p. 144.

† Aquinas in Opusc. 60. Art. 3. et 3 Part. qu. 27. Art. 4.

‡ Pelbartus was hard put to it, when in answer to that place of St. Augustine (ad Petrum, Firmissime tene omnem hominem qui per concubitum concipitur, cum peccato originali nasci) he says it is, qui per concubitum, Maria autem non fuit qui sed quæ. Aurei Rosar. tom. 5. p. 101.

§ In Epist. ad Rom. c. 5. disp. 51.

tender point more like an enthusiast (not to say a Protestant) than a good Catholic. "For among other things," he asserts, "that the argument from authority is weak and infirm; that the strength and efficacy of the reasons he has urged is to be preferred before it; that God does not reveal all truths to all, but every age glories in its proper verities, which the former age was unacquainted with (which he would never have mentioned, if he had not known this to be a novelty), that the doctors the younger they are, they are so much the more quick-sighted." This is pretty coarse usage, methinks, of old friends, especially knowing how much they fawn on them and flatter them upon other occasions: and Fathers are the only things they are fond of, and they talk of nothing else; but in this case, you see, where they cannot persuade them to speak on their side, they take snuff and are sullen, and any youngster or upstart doctor shall be preferred before them.

But leaving this and all other little arguments urged by the Immaculists, such as those of our late Contemplator,* "that Jesus had not perfectly appeased God's wrath against men, had he not preserved one soul from sin and God's anger incurred by it." And again, "that innocency is much more honourable and valuable than sanctification; and therefore it becomes a most perfect Mediator much rather to preserve the innocency of some one, than only to purchase the sanctification of all." Passing over these, I say, and such like,

I now come to that wherein the Immaculists glory most, *viz.* the proof from miracles and revelations; which indeed gives great spirit to them, and wherein their adversaries cannot compare with them, no not so much as in pretence.

This made one of them say, "If we are deceived in this particular, none has deceived us but God, seeing such wonders are done under the name of the blessed Virgin's conception, which could be performed only by the power of God."† And Catharinus says, "That by interposing (in their prayers) the immaculate conception, healing the sick, and other admirable gifts were obtained in his time."‡ To give a few of their instances. That of Alexander Ales is recorded by many,§ who, upon the eighth of December, having taught publicly that the blessed Virgin's conception was maculate, he was presently

* Contemplat. of H. Mary, p. 31.

† Bern. de Bust. Serm. 9. p. 115.

Lib. 4. contra Cajetanum [Paris, 1535.]

§ Raynaudus, *ibid.* p. 139.

seized with a grievous disease, which had a yearly return upon that day; who finding the true cause of his distemper, he made a vow that he would change his opinion for the future, and write a book to prove it: upon the making of which vow a sudden cure followed. This, Carthagina says,* is told by himself in his book of her Conception, remaining in the cathedral of Toulouse.

A friar of Mantua,† having prepared himself for a public disputation to prove that she was conceived in sin, when he came to argue, the blessed Virgin changed the words in his mouth, so that he spake thus to his auditors: "I propose to you this true conclusion, that the blessed Virgin was conceived without original sin;" and though he was told of his mistake, and said he would correct it, yet he still asserted her purity a second and a third time. At Cracow, in Poland,‡ one Paul, a monk, declaiming against the immaculate conception in a sermon, before he had ended it, he fell down dead in the pulpit by the just judgment of God. A schoolmaster at Mantesa,§ in Spain, having severely chastised a youth under his care, was killed by a kinsman of that youth. As the body was preparing for the funeral, and laid upon the bier, suddenly the dead man starts up, and spake to the amazed company, telling them, that by the favour of God he was brought to life, that he might make a public retractation of a false opinion he in his lifetime had embraced concerning the blessed Virgin's being conceived in original sin; he did what God commanded him, and after this laid himself down on the bier and died. This narration was drawn in the cloister of the collegiate church at Mantesa, which when some would have had it obliterated, the Inquisition of Barcelona, discussing the matter, determined it should remain.

At Rome,|| in the ides of November, 1652, a virgin being in great torment by the stone, a confessor of hers gave her a piece of paper to be applied to the grieved part, with this inscription, *Conceptio Immacula S. Die Genetricis Mariæ*. The nun, instead of applying it, swallowed the paper, and immediately voided two stones, upon which one added,

* De Arcan. deip. l. 1. hom. 19.

† Bern. de Bust. Serin. 6. de Conc. Virg. p. 80.

‡ Spondani Continuat. ad an. 1350.

§ Raynaudus, *ibid.* ex Nieremberg. in vita S. Ignati.

|| Raynaudus, *ibid.*

“Conceptionem labis expertem negas ?
Lapides loquuntur, lapidis hoc verbum, sat est.”

That is,

“Dost thou deny that her conception’s pure ?
When stones proclaim it, thou’lt believe it sure.”

In Italy, a nun of the order of St. Francis,* contending with another nun who opposed the immaculate conception, said to her, “Let a great fire be kindled, and let us both enter into it, and she that is burnt will be proved to hold a false opinion.” They both agreed, and went into the fire; the Franciscan nun escaping, the other was presently consumed.

The like miracle he tells† of a laic and another person; the laic believed the immaculate conception, and entered into the fire, and challenged the other that disputed against it to do the like, but he durst not try, and the other remained untouched.

The same Bernardine‡ assures us, that many of the friars that were subject to his own court at Milan, importuned him earnestly, that in defence of the blessed Virgin’s innocency, he would suffer them to make that trial with their adversaries by entering into the fire; he did not think there was any canonical prohibition of such experiments, because (as his words are) “they that are acted by the Spirit of God are not under the law,” Gal. v. Yet he would not give his consent, partly because the blessed Virgin could otherways defend her purity, and partly believing that the impugnors would not accept the proposal; or if they should, that they would have been suddenly burnt (concluding so, I suppose, by what had happened before in the like case).

Another miracle he mentions,§ a very remarkable one, and how he came to be acquainted with it, of one friar Thomas de Bohemia, that had one of his legs dried up, and utterly in-feebled (*omni vigore destituta*) so that he despaired of a cure, and was advised by the physicians to have it cut off: but in this distress he betook himself to the blessed Virgin, and prayed, “that she would restore soundness to him for the praise of her immaculate conception.” In honour of which he celebrated a mass, standing in great torment upon one foot. When the mass was ended, he was perfectly cured and freed from his old infirmity; so that he who before could not go,

* Bernardin. de Bust. *ibid.* Serm. 6. p. 82.

† *Ibid.* p. 94.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 11.

§ *Id. ib.* p. 82.

came without help to Rome on foot, and this morning, says Bernardine, told me this miracle.

Revelations they have also many to boast of;* those that are most cried up, and the most express, are those of St. Bridget (lib. 1. c. 9. et lib. 9. c. 49.), and their authors † take a great deal of pains to prove, that the revelations of St. Catharine on the other side are feigned on purpose to oppose hers. Gonsalvus had the like revelation, who was taught by the blessed Virgin herself, that her first animation was not only without sin, but brightened with wonderful splendours of grace: and Pelbartus says ‡ the same was revealed to St. Elizabeth.

Visions also they relate, such whose signification is not doubtful, but which clearly and punctually express it and determine for it. Thus we are told, § “That a master of divinity in Paris being to preach on the day of the blessed Virgin’s conception, had prepared to discourse against it: the night before, as he was in his study, there appeared a company of doctors and angels, and a seat was made ready, upon which sat down a noble queen, who called for this master, and said thus to him: ‘What harm, I pray, have I ever done to thee, that this morning thou shouldst design to preach against mine honour?’ and saying this, she commanded him to be scourged; whereupon he fell upon his knees and begged her pardon. Then the blessed Virgin said to the angel Gabriel, ‘Go and teach this man a sermon for this morning before the university.’ Then Gabriel said to him, ‘Open thy mouth, and I will fill it:’ whereupon he perceived an admirable sermon in his heart, in which it was demonstrated that the Queen of Heaven was conceived without original sin, and he preached it in the morning following to the people of Paris.” The same author || tells us, that a bishop of Padua, as he was reading St. Thomas’s *Sums*, wondered that he determined against the Virgin’s immaculate conception; to whom St. Thomas appeared and said, “Know, sir, that when I laid down that opinion I only had respect to the Divine decree, whereby the blessed Virgin ought to have contracted original sin, unless she should be preserved from it by her Son: but the Son of God did preserve his mother from it: and so he disappeared” St.

* Raynaudus, *ibid.* p. 139.

† Catharinus adv. Cajetanum, lib. 4. Delrio *disq. Magic.* l. 4. c. 1. qu. 3, &c. [Paris, 1535.]

‡ Stellarii, l. 4. part. 1. art. 3.

§ Bernar. de Bust. *Marial.* serm. 6. p. 70.

|| *Ibid.* p. 79.

Bernard also, who was another stiff opposer of her immaculateness, is reported * to have appeared to a certain monk after his death, having a spot upon his breast, signifying that he was now of another mind, and did penance, as it were, for what he had written before against it.

The reader, I hope, has had some pleasure (and that was all that I intended him) in viewing the foregoing odd and fantastic arguments used by the Immaculists in this debate. But from this latter proof by miracles and revelations, every Protestant may reap much benefit and advantage, considering what service they have done our cause hereby, before they are aware. For,

1. We think ourselves excused from all obligations to believe, upon the account of miracles and revelations they urge us withal, and bring as a demonstration for any article of their faith that is not one of ours. One Frederick Fornerus, a bishop of their Church, has wrote a whole book about this argument, called *Palma Triumphalis Miraculorum Catholice Ecclesiæ, et imprimis gloriosissimæ Virginis Mariæ*, Ingolst. 1622, and in the 39th chapter of the first book, he insults over the Calvinists and Lutherans for want of miracles : but, alas ! he and a hundred others that have made collections of this nature, might have spared their pains, for they themselves have taught us how to deal with this argument : for do any of the Immaculists value a farthing all the stories that their adversaries have told them of this kind ? Do not they account them all as cheats, and tell the world so ? And if the Dominicans do not make the same reckoning of all that these pretend, why are they not converted to their opinion ? Here are two parties that divide their whole Church, and both of them urge each other as they do us with miracles, and each hold the opinion they did before, notwithstanding this ; and pray why may we not do so too ? I am sure I have produced as substantial miracles for the kind, as any they object to us. For what can be greater than to continue in the fire unhurt, when it consumes another to ashes (which was the miracle of the three children) ? or for a dead man to start up and proclaim the blessed Virgin free from original sin, and when he has told his errand, immediately to die again ? What wonders of the Lady of Loretto, or the *Diva Halensis* or *Aspricollis*, which are so often rung in our ears, can outvie these ? How many

* Novarini, umbr. Virg. p. 65 n. 207.

of their authors have told us, and Father Godden * among the rest, the miracles of John Damascene's hand cut off by the command of the Emperor, and restored by praying before an image of the Virgin? recorded in his life by John, a patriarch of Jerusalem. I will not question whether it was his hand or his finger (as the author of his conversation† relates), which might easily in that age improve into a hand. Nor will I insist upon another story of the same kind, concerning the hand of Pope Leo I. which is said also to have been restored by the blessed Virgin, after it was cut off by himself, and is related in a manuscript life of St. Leo, says Bollandus,‡ in the *Lombardica Historia*, in *Pet. de Natalibus*, *Dionys. Carthusianus*, *Nauclerus*,§ the *Historia Pontifical*, in Spanish, by Gonzalo de Illescas (who says he would not have set it down but that he found it in grave authors) was commonly represented in pictures, which is an argument of current tradition: yet after all Baromus || condemns it for a fable, and Pope Clement VIII. commanded the pictures of it to be razed out. The reason, I suppose, of smothering this miracle was, because of the occasion of it, which seemed to reflect scandalously upon so holy a Pope, who, as Nauclerus says, "was vehemently tempted (with lustful inclination) by a woman's kissing his hand, when she made her oblation at the mass on an Easter-day," though it seems to be better attested than that of Damascene's hand, which has only one witness produced for it; and those libidinous motions might have been excused, from what has befallen other great saints: for to overcome such temptations St. Benedict ¶ rolled himself in thorns and nettles; and St. Bernard was fain to use the remedy of leaping into cold water.** Not to invalidate this miracle, I say, but to let it pass, I shall only oppose the foregoing story of the leg of Thomas de Bohemia (which also may be opposed against that other famed miracle of restoring the leg to the youth of Saragosa), and yet not one Thomist does believe upon it that immaculate conception to which the cure is owing; though we shall be as bad as infidels if that hand and leg do not make us fall down and worship the blessed Virgin; or if we do not almost adore virginity, when we read of St. Euphemia,†† that she, to avoid marriage, cut off

* Catholics no Idolaters, p. 424.

† Apud Cent Magdeb. sec. 8.

‡ De S. Leone Apr. 11.

§ Chronog. general 15.

|| Annal. tom. 6. in Leone Papa ad Ann. 461.

¶ Greg. Dial. l. 2. c. 2.

** In vit. ejus per Gulielmum, l. 1. c. 3.

†† Speculum Exempl. dist. 9. exempl. 20.

her nose and lips, and had them restored afterwards by the blessed Virgin. Methinks, therefore, we should have a little better quarter, notwithstanding this argument; especially when we see how kind they are to themselves, in not pressing it too hard where they are themselves concerned. For Gr. de Valentia * tells you, “that miracles of themselves (*i. e.* without the Church) do not cause infallible certainty of the truth of a doctrine;” and therefore he calls them afterwards “a prudent motive:” and Bellarmine says,† “Before the approbation of the Church, it is not evident or certain with a certainty of faith, of any miracle, that it is a true miracle.” And another Jesuit ‡ more fully: “Neither miracles nor revelations are a motive sufficient of themselves to oblige all the faithful to believe a thing with a divine catholic faith (as he calls it), though a relation may oblige him to whom it is made to believe with a divine private faith (and so a miracle, I suppose, may oblige his private faith upon whom it is wrought): yet it is not to be denied that both of them are very fit motives, and may be looked upon to have a kind of sprinkling of Divine authority upon them (*Divina autoritate aliquatenus perfusum*).” The plain meaning of which is, that God cannot deliver his mind fully to us, so as to engage us peremptorily to believe him, though it may be prudent to do so, unless he deliver his mind by the Pope. And that there may be no mistake of his sense, we have it all out in another place:§ “I say that the argument fetched from miracles does not clearly and unquestionably (*ineluctabiliter*) convince that truth to be confirmed by the testimony of God, speaking by a miracle as it were by his own mouth:” which is strange, that when a miracle speaks such a thing and nothing else, and is acknowledged to be such a miracle as God only can work, that it should not confirm that thing to be true as if he spake it. A man might swear that he is not urging us with this argument of miracles, but intends this as a favour somewhere else, as the words following do inform us: “for (says he) if it were so, then it must be granted that the proposition affirming the blessed Virgin’s conception to have been immaculate, has the certainty of faith for it, which it is plain cannot be yet affirmed, because of the silence of the Church (that is, with a Jesuit, of the Pope) in this matter.”¶ And he

* *Analys. fidei*, l. 1. c. 6.

† *De Eccles.* l. 4. c. 14.

‡ *Raynaudus Diptych.* Mar. p. 139.

§ *Raynaudus in defens. scapular. Marian.* p. 291.

adds, "that he does very piously, who from hence gives a firm assent to it, *sed infra certitudinem divinæ fidei*, but short of the certainty of divine faith." Those words, then, of "pious assent," and "prudential motives," and such like, are tricks, and only words of course; for one "of the Church" may believe in this case either way, and has free leave to do it, without being condemned: so that God may do what miracles he pleases on one side, and yet a man may safely be on the other side, till the Pope contradicts it: so that it is he plainly that can only oblige him to believe to purpose. Which gives me occasion to reflect upon a second good use that the former considerations of miracles and revelations will afford us, *viz.* a plain discovery of the restiveness of their unerring guide, infallible judge, and determiner of controversies in some cases. For those miracles, &c. have but little to say to any but him, and he, when he pleases, has nothing to say notwithstanding them. If one should be so bold to question the Pope after St. Paul's manner: Dost thou believe miracles and revelations in this affair of the blessed Virgin? I doubt the answer could not be returned so easily, I know thou believest. He is not so quickly understood, I assure you, nor his mind so easily known: he has often put on several faces, and by his various appearances given occasion to complain, *Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?* Yet methinks, we have some good hold of him, and shall not easily let it go.

"Here slippery Proteus thou art caught at last,
Change all thy shapes, this knot will hold thee fast."

For either the Pope believes those miracles, visions and revelations for the proof of the immaculate conception (to instance only in those), or he does not. If he does not believe them, surely we are fairly excused from being concerned about them, since he has greater opportunities than we can have to find out their cheat if they be forged: and if they were true, his faith should be the forwardest: but if he does believe them, then the matter is worse, considering the place he sits in; for he pretends to be the unerring guide (as I said) of faith, the judge and determiner of controversies. It is boasted as a privilege of his Church, that its differences can never be endless (though those of other Churches may), for here is one appointed to decide them, and his decision liable to no mistake. Very good: and why is not this controversy then determined? It has been a controversy in his Church of four hundred years'

standing, and yet every judge in succession that has sat in this chair has been dumb, and his infallibility lain by, and nobody has been the better for it. It cannot be pleaded on his behalf, that the thing is not weighty enough to be determined, and to become an article of catholic faith ; for whatsoever we may think of it, yet he dares not own that he thinks so, when it is about a glorious privilege of the blessed Virgin ; and when he is now supposed to believe the revelations and miracles to be divine that do attest it ; for God surely does not use to interpose in that manner about trifles. He cannot be excused neither for hiding this precious talent of his, and not employing it for want of a sufficient call thereto ; for besides that loud one of miracles, &c. which he is quick enough of hearing when he has a mind to canonize a saint, or institute a festival ; he has been loudly summoned to exercise his judging faculty, by the cries and beseechings of all sorts both high and low, to pity the divided Church and heal its breaches, to becalm the boisterous tempest that has threatened to sink the ship of the Church, by one powerful word of his ; but all in vain : he lies as one in a dead sleep, and nothing can awaken him. What applications have been made to him, the following story shews.

SECT. IV.

The History of the Embassy from two Kings of Spain to Rome, to obtain a Decision of the Controversy about the Immaculate Conception.

UPON occasion of what I said last, how the Pope has been loudly importuned to put an end to controversies, I cannot well pass over that famous history of the embassy from Philip III. and IV. Kings of Spain, to Pope Paul V. and Pope Gregory XV. for deciding this controversy about the conception of the Virgin, which is given us by Luc. Wadding. a Franciscan,* out of whom I shall give the sum of it.

At the beginning almost of his story, he acknowledges that though heretofore the Maculists might freely and without offence have declared their opinion ;† yet now a-days the contrary opinion has so possessed men's minds, that neither the rabble nor the sober people, the noted doctors or great bishops, can endure to hear it. This devotion to the Virgin, he says, prevailed wonderfully in Spain about eight years before, and

* *Legatio Philippi 3. et Ph. 4. ad Paul. 5. et Greg. 15. Lovan. 1624.*
per Luc. Waddingum.

† P. 3.

was chiefly excited by one Francis à san Jago, a Franciscan, who was fore-admonished by the blessed Virgin of Guadalupe (a place in Spain where she has a famous image) of the increase of the veneration and worship of her immaculate conception within a few years, though not without contradiction and tumult; and for a sign of the truth of this, she bestowed upon him a ring.* Upon this he became a zealous promoter of this mystery, and the people, especially of Bœtica, applauded it, setting up trophies of the Virgin's victory over original sin, causing this inscription to be fixed on the corners of streets, highways, and on the fronts of churches, "Mary was conceived without original sin."

But the Maculists† were not idle in promoting their own, and opposing and exposing the received and common doctrine; calling it heterodox and abominable, reviling those that dissented from them, and following them with insufferable injuries; who being thus provoked, prepare revenge and war; so that with this dissension all Spain was on a flame, which occasioned Pope Paul V. to send forth his Apostolic letters,‡ dated July 6, 1616, wherein he renewed the constitution of Sixtus IV. "which forbade the condemning the opinion of the immaculate conception for heresy, as also the Council of Trent and Pius V. had done, prohibiting any to preach about this controversy before a promiscuous multitude, or to write concerning it in the vulgar tongue either way: although permitting learned men in public disputations of the universities, and of general or provincial chapters, where they were present that could understand the matter, and no occasion of scandal likely to be given, to discuss that question, and by arguments to assert or oppose either part; so that neither were asserted to be erroneous, &c. Threatening penalties against the transgressors, till the controversy were decided by the Pope." After this the Catholic King, moved by the complaints of the people, consults with the Pope's legate and other learned prelates, whether these constitutions of the Pope did sufficiently extinguish this flame; who gave their judgment in the negative.

The Catholic King resolves therefore to petition the Pope for a more effectual remedy, and sends Placidus de Tosantes, sometime General of the Benedictines in Spain, with two others, to Rome about it.§ These obtained this decree of the Inquisition, confirmed by his Holiness, Aug. 31, 1617, "That

* P. 4.

† P. 6.

‡ P. 7.

§ P. 14.

the opinion of the Maculists, which occasioned so much scandal, strife and dissension among Christian people, should in no wise be any longer asserted in public sermons, lectures, conclusions, or any other public acts, affirming that the blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin; notwithstanding it was strictly and severely cautioned also, that their opinion should not be impugned by others, no, nor so much as named or mentioned in the aforesaid public acts; because his Holiness did not intend hereby to reprobate that opinion, or to do it any prejudice, but left it in the same state and terms that he found it."

This was received with great joy in Spain by the people, who favoured the immaculate conception; they feasted and entertained themselves with plays and shows, judging that their business was sufficiently done. But others that were wiser foretold the contrary, and that it would give occasion to greater scandals: and so it proved; for the Maculists raised new tumults, and the disorders were increased, and both parties broke out into cruel and railing invectives against each other. The King, therefore, by the advice of his Council, determined to send a new embassy to the Pope, to move him that he would command the Maculists wholly to be silent till he had decided the controversy.* Whilst he was preparing and consulting about the person that should carry this embassy, the King receives a letter from the Pope, wherein he desires him to forbear urging him farther for a decision of the controversy, subscribing with his own hand, that he had done what was expedient in the last decree, and all that he could do (*totum quod potuit*) in this matter.

The King, thereupon, thinking to desist, he is so alarmed afresh with the news of tumults from divers cities and kingdoms, that he resolved upon a new embassy, and chooses for it Antonius de Treio, sometime General of the Franciscans, whom he chose to be Bishop of Sosa, who came with the King's letters to Rome, dated Sept. 24, 1618.† Together with which he delivered several other packets of the same import with the King's, soliciting the decision, *viz.* a packet from the kingdom of Portugal; another of Spain; letters of the Archbishop of Toletum and his suffragan bishops; letters of the Archbishop of Compostella and his suffragans: another bundle of letters from all the universities of Spain; another from the fathers con-

* P. 22.

† P. 30.

fessors to the King and Prince, and other lerrned doctors of the order of the Predicants; with other three bundles of letters from the prefects and provincials of all the orders except one. To all which the Pope, after he had commended the piety of the King, and the devotion of the kingdoms to the blessed Virgin,* answered, "That he could do no more than he had done in this controversy, and that the matter required more mature consideration than he could afford it."

On the same day he visited and delivered the King's letters to several cardinals and ambassadors of princes, declaring the King's desires, and begging their assistance in this matter that concerned the honour of the blessed Virgin; and gave an account of all to his master in a letter dated December 23, 1618. Wherein he informs what he had done, and the difficulties of the affair;† telling him, among other things, that the Pope's answer was, "*that God had not yet inspired, nor his conscience as yet dictated any thing to him, besides that which was before commanded in his late decree, and then was asked on his Majesty's behalf.*" The ambassador could do no more that month, because of the approaching feast of the Nativity of our Lord.‡ After the festival was over, the ambassador offers to the Pope an oration, containing an humble petition and a sad complaint against the actions and interpretations of the Maculists, who wrested the last decree, and made it to favour themselves. He complained also, that since the decree they taught their opinion more eagerly, that nobody offered to repress their excesses, that in desks and pulpits they detracted from the credit of their adversaries, calling them ignorant, idiots, simple, fools, &c.§ He represented the scandals also that must needs arise from the different observations of her feast, whilst instead of celebrating her conception without sin, some celebrated her sanctification from sin. To all this, and more, which the ambassador urged, the Pope, after he had commended the pious affection of the King, told him, by way of answer,|| that Popes could not always satisfy the desires of kings and princes, especially in those things which are determined not by a human, but by a divine sentence, such as require not man's judgment, but the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and an inward impulse; and the Spirit breathes when and where it listeth (by which answer we may perceive what opinion the Pope would have the people have of his determina-

* P. 31.

† P. 41.

‡ P. 44.

§ P. 51.

|| P. 54.

tions). The ambassador also offered an apology for his master,* whom some had reflected upon as too busy about ecclesiastical affairs, if he would constrain the Pope against his mind :† he offered also a second oration to the Pope, in which he complained of the scandals in Spain, and represented the advantages of a definition, and concluded with this speech to the Pope,‡ “Consider the loss of many souls, the discord of the Church, the dissensions of cities, and the great dangers that hang over kingdoms, all which you only are able to obviate and prevent.” The Pope still persisted in his denial, that he could not then define the controversy. In the interim the King gives his ambassador notice of the continuation of the scandals, and sent him three sermons, preached at Madrid, and elsewhere, in which the adversaries urged their opinion after the decree. He complained also of the theses maintained at Douay,§ and of a book of Fr. Sylvius, in which he disputes against the immaculate conception. The Pope answered, that these abuses should be punished.

After this the ambassador gave in a third paper,|| wherein he sets forth the weightiness of the matter, and after he had given large encomiums of the Virgin out of divers authors, he complained that her sanctity was called in question, and the controversy managed irreligiously and irreverently; and one declared, that she was conceived just as other women, and that Mary’s conception was not more pure than that of Mahomet. He added, it was a vain thing to dissemble the difference, and not to take away the cause of it, which otherwise would end in contempt of Mary, the grief and horror of the people, and a decay of devotion towards the mother of God.

He represented what advantage the heretics made of these contentions, to deride the unity of the Church so much boasted of.¶ He said it was horrible,** “that while the priest offered the body of Christ in honour of the immaculate conception,” there should be found those among themselves that should deride and insult, saying, that it was to be rejected, and that all was figments and chimeras, &c. At the conclusion of his oration,†† among other things he urged the Pope withal to make a decision, he mentioned this, that hereby the truth of those many miracles wrought by God and the saints in testimony of the immaculate conception, would be more apparent, and the certainty of many revelations confirmed. (Which

* P. 56.

|| P. 92.

† P. 79.

¶ P. 103.

‡ P. 89.

** P. 106.

§ P. 91.

†† P. 113.

was well urged, since any one would think they themselves did not give credit to what they would have us believe, when the Pope knows not what to say to the matter after all.)

The Pope replied, that he stood well affected to the immaculate conception, but intimated that his definition would not remove the disturbances,* since the Maculists insisted that theirs was the "unanimous doctrine of all the Fathers," and in particular produced the testimonies for it of St. Augustine, Lombard and Bonaventure. The ambassador, understanding that the adversaries had collected the sentences of the Fathers, and offered them to the Pope, he put in a fourth paper, wherein he shewed that the authority of the holy Fathers indeed was great, especially in establishing weak opinions; but to counterfeit it was dangerous; that the doctors were falsely cited by the adversaries, and three only truly; that every doctor might err, which St. Augustine confesses of himself, and if St. Thomas had lived now, he would have been of another mind; and he concluded,† "That there was none after the Apostles, who were not Popes, that might not err:" and then turning to the Pope, "In thee alone, and the bishops in thy chair, no error has place; in thee truth is established, and in thy seat has set up her venerable and perpetual throne; from that throne no lie can ever arise." After he had flattered the Pope, he obtained of him a book of P. de Vincentia, a Dominican, in which the sayings of the Fathers were collected for the Maculists' opinion, which were taken out of two books of Vinc. Bandellus, which fiercely opposed the immaculate conception. And the orator endeavoured in a fifth paper to shew that these books contained such things as were condemned by the bull of Sixtus IV. Particularly he gave in the heads of Bandellus's books, which contained the severest charges against the opinion of the Immaculists; as that it was a mortal error, full of falsity, impious, and pernicious; that it was injurious to the blood of Christ, making her neither to be reconciled nor justified by it; that an opinion founded in the holy Scriptures was to be preferred before the determinations of Pope and Council; that the Immaculists did contradict Scripture, and perniciously depraved them, and defended the heresy of Pelagius and Julianus,‡ in their expositions: he affirms, that the persons to whom revelations are said to be made concerning the Virgin's immaculate conception, were suspected

* P. 116.

† P. 129.

‡ P. 134.

persons, addicted to carnal vices,* and discovering that they had nothing of spirituality in them; that the miracles brought to confirm it were wrought by the devil, who, by God's permission, kealed some infirmities upon invoking the immaculate conception; that so he that was filthy might be filthy still. After many such charges (which may be seen in the history) he produced the testimonies of two hundred and sixty famous doctors who were against it. This work of Bandellus, which was in many hands that made ill use of it, the ambassador urged that it might, by an edict, be put among the catalogue of prohibited books. But the Pope made answer, that the constitution of Sixtus IV. (which begins *Grave nimis*, &c.) was sufficient.

After this the ambassador put in a sixth paper,† to prove that the difference of the adversaries in celebrating the feast of the conception, was not to be tolerated, and that it was fit they should be commanded to celebrate it unanimously with the universal Church. The Pope returned that he had often dealt about it, and desired that this mystery might be equally celebrated by all; but it was always answered by the Maculists, that they did the same with others under the name of her sanctification (not conception), which comprehended all. Whereupon in a seventh speech,‡ the orator endeavoured to shew that the Catholic Church, in the feast of the blessed Virgin's conception, did now, and always, intend nothing else thereby, than to celebrate her preservation from original sin, so that in no instant she was actually subject to it. The Pope said he did not doubt of this, that the Church intended by their worship of the conception to profess that Mary was preserved from original sin; but it was better in this turbulent and calamitous state of the empire, to study and endeavour peace at home, than by innovating to beget intestine broils. Notwithstanding this answer, the ambassador offered an eighth paper,§ to shew how great the inequality was between the opinions; and that an opinion which at one time was probable, at another time might become altogether improbable; that truths do not appear all at one time, but some are reserved for every age; that many things accounted dubious by the ancients, are now looked upon as certain and unquestionable; such as the validity of the baptism of heretics; the seeing the Divine essence before the day of judgment; that angels are incorporeal; and that souls are

* P. 140.

† P. 149.

‡ P. 172.

§ P. 201.

immediately created by God, and such like : which he applied to this matter of the conception, which, though it was not so clear in the ages before, yet after the appearance of Scotus (about the year 1300), who opened the controversy with all acuteness, the Maculists' opinion did decline, and the contrary ever after got ground of it. After this he endeavoured to prove his own opinion about the immaculate conception by various reasons, too large to be repeated. The Pope made answer,* that he acknowledged the great probability of the Immaculists' opinion, and that its state and terms were better ; but the adversaries still maintained that theirs still kept its place, and had not lost all probability, nor that the " pious opinion " was so undoubted and irrefragable, that for its sake the contrary should be exploded : nay, they further added, that if it should come to a definition (which some say is impossible), that the sentence must needs go on their side, because of the authority of the Scripture, the doctors, and St. Thomas ; nor that it could, at least ought not, be carried for the pious one.

The ambassador not being yet satisfied,† he adds a ninth treatise, to prove that the controversy concerning the Virgin Mary's conception might be ended by a definitive sentence of the Church, and that no other sentence, but for her immaculate conception, could be propounded by the Church with certainty of faith ; and gave many reasons to shew the expediency of doing it as soon as might be. The Pope replied,‡ that there was no need of arguments to prove that the controversy was capable of decision ; he knew well how much he was able to do in it ; neither did he doubt of his power, but of the convenience and necessity of defining it ; that this was by no means a fit season for the examination and exact determination of this matter.

Thus things stood whilst this ambassador managed them : § but when, by reason of this delay of the Pope in defining (to which he could not be brought by all these repeated urgings) the differences in Spain increased daily ; the King chose a more illustrious ambassador, the Duke Albuquerque, and sent him to Rome, where the first thing he met with was a complaint, that the Master of the Sacred Palace|| had prohibited the making any more medals of the conception, and confiscated those which he found made. These medals had been coined for the Spaniards, and on one side had the image of the body

* P. 234. † P. 236. ‡ P. 289. § P. 291. || P. 295.

of Christ and of the chalice, with this inscription, *Alabado sia el santissimo sacramento* : that is, "Let the most holy sacrament be praised." On the other side was an hieroglyphic image of the immaculate conception,* surrounded with St. Francis's cord, and this inscription, *Concepta sine peccato originali*, "Mary was conceived without original sin." This the Duke complained of to the Pope, and his Duchess humbly begged that there might be leave granted to coin and disperse them as formerly. He referred the matter to Cardinal Cobelutius, who, after a few days, told them that he thought their desire would be granted, together with indulgences, if these words *pìè creditur†* (it is piously believed) were adjoined to the former inscription, to prevent the mistake of the people, and the fear of the adversaries, that it might not be thought that the matter was defined for the Immaculists, and the contrary opinion exploded. This the ambassador, upon deliberation, would not consent to, but insisted that in favour of the Duchess the medals might be allowed without exception : but nothing was further done in it.

The former ambassador‡ having received letters from the King for his return, before he departed he presented two or three tractates to the Pope. The one was about revelations, especially those of St. Bridget, which he defended against the adversaries, and endeavoured to lessen the authority of those of St. Catharine of Siena : and then applied himself to the Pope, exhorting him to make an end of the difference ; urging him with the definitions of other Popes, which relied upon revelations, &c. As for instance, Pope Pius I. defined the controversy on what day Easter was to be kept, moved by a revelation made to Friar Hermes : Urban IV. instituted the festival of *Corpus Christi* day, upon an instinct and revelation made to a certain woman : who also decreed Paul the hermit to be a saint, and to be invoked, only because Anthony the abbot reported (as St. Jerome says) that he saw his soul fly up to heaven, and his sanctity was revealed to him. The feast also of Michael the Archangel was instituted upon the testimony of the Bishop of Sipontines, and certain

* This is explained among the indulgences, at the end of the holy bull of the Crusado, granted by Gregory XIII., and approved by the Inquisition, dated at Lisbon 1588, Apr. 6. viz. the image of the Virgin in metal, clothed with the sun-beams, crowned with stars, with the moon at her feet, and the cord of St. Francis round about.

† P. 306.

‡ Page 335.

rude neatherds, concerning an apparition of his upon Mount Garganus, and then concludes pathetically ; " O blessed father," speaking to the Pope,* " pity the calamities, and remove the contentions of Christian people : be at length overcome by the Catholic King's prayers for the pacifying of his kingdoms : remember how much better it is, that the orthodox should contest with the insulting heretics when they are united, than oppose and rend one another : take away this troublesome doubt by one word, and compose this dangerous controversy by thy last sentence." But he might as well have said all this to the winds, and had as good an answer.

Another paper he put in,† to shew that the Pope was bound by his office to provide a timely remedy for these great and growing scandals, arising from the liberty of opining in this controversy of the blessed Virgin's conception, and the tolerating the Maculists' opinion ; in which he shewed, out of approved authors and authentic proceedings of courts, how these scandals had been notorious, and continued, notwithstanding all that had been yet done to hinder them, in France, in Italy, in Germany, and especially in the kingdom of Spain, in all places of it ; which scandals he proved to continue still after his decree, so that there was no remedy remaining but that of a peremptory definition.

The history further tells us, that in Spain the scandals still increasing, and cities and people being divided into factions, some academics, and rich cities, and whole kingdoms did bind themselves by oaths and vows to defend the opinion of the immaculate conception ; and we are told by others,‡ of particular universities that thus bound themselves, those of Mentz, Colen, Paris, and that in all the universities of Spain it was established by a special decree, that none should be admitted to the degree of doctor, till first he had promised upon oath never to oppose this truth.

After all this stir, and doing nothing, the former ambassador took his leave of the Pope, who told him that he was sorry that he could not satisfy the King's pious wishes in this matter : " but," he said, § " that which was desired was not of that sort of things which is within the limits of human diligence, or which, by reason of necessity, or worldly instances,

* P. 373.

† P. 375.

‡ Vid. August. Barbosa Remissiones in Conc. Trident. Sess. 5.

§ P. 424.

or the power of kings, may presently be granted, until the Spirit from on high shall infuse what in such a weighty controversy ought to be gravely and maturely deliberated." Now shame on this vile hypocrisy; which, when every one may see this matter wholly conducted by interest, and cowardly fear of disobliging a powerful party, dares to talk of the Spirit from on high, and imitate the fulsome language of a canting enthusiast.

When this ambassador was gone, Albuquerque, upon whom the whole care of this affair was devolved, insists upon it afresh, and receives the same dilatory answers from Pope Paul V. who, upon the fourth of the calends of February, 1621,* departed this life and was succeeded by Gregory XV., to whom this Duke applies himself in the name of his master; who, commending, as his predecessor had done, the piety of the King, told him he would comply with him when time and circumstances of things, after a foregoing grave examination of the matter, would give him leave.

But presently after Philip III. of Spain dies, and chose to do it in the habit of a Franciscan, and left the care of this embassy to his son, Philip IV., his successor, who confirmed Albuquerque therein.

About this time not only the old contests and scandals which troubled Spain, but a new occasion of an extraordinary ambassador to Rome, made the King to ply the former business: he writes therefore to Albuquerque to urge the business, and give the letter to the Pope which he sent. The Queen also, the Infanta of Spain, and Margaret the daughter of Maximilian the emperor, all wrote to the Pope. The ambassador had a hearing, and a general answer of good hope was given him, that the Pope thought of nothing now but to remove those scandals that continued, &c. Awhile after a new ambassador (*Comes Montis Regij*) arrives at Rome: he was sent thither to assist at the canonization of five new saints (four of which were Spaniards), Isidore of Madrid, Ignatius Loyola, Fran. Xavierius, Teresia à Jesu; and one Italian, Philip Nereus. This Count† was brought into the Pope in great state and magnificence, and begged in favour to him that the Pope would put his last hand to this business, who promised that something should be done in it before his departure. And in order to it several cardinals were appointed, to whom their desires should be

* P. 431.

† P. 443.

proposed. Two things they offered to them. First, That it was more desirable that the controversy might be determined. Secondly, If by the straitness of time that could not be done, then in the *interim*, that whatsoever did seem to contradict the immaculate conception, might be removed and banished from discourses and worship, in all acts both public and private, otherwise matters would never be pacified in Spain.

The cardinals approved of what they desired, and represented it to the Pope, who, in a full congregation of the Senate of the Inquisition, approved the cardinals' thoughts about prohibiting in all acts the maintaining that opinion which gave the people offence, and taking away the word *sanctification* out of the Church. And upon May 24, 1622,* came forth^a a decree, which repeating those of Sixtus IV. and Paul V. and confirming them, farther commanded, that for the future, till this article should be determined by the apostolic chair, neither in private discourses or in writings, any one should dare to assert that the blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin, nor handle anything concerning this opinion, excepting only those who were specially privileged herein by the Pope. Also his Holiness commanded, that since the holy Roman Church celebrates solemnly the feast and office of the Conception of the Virgin Mary, that all persons ecclesiastical and secular, and those of every order in the holy sacrifice of the mass, and other divine offices, both public and private, should use no other word but that of *conception*, instead of *sanctification*, &c.

Now again the Immaculists,† after this decree, are trepanned into new rejoicing; the Franciscans, in their convent on the top of the Capitol, for three nights together had fireworks and signs of great triumph, as if they had got the victory.

On the 4th of June, 1622,‡ a brief of the Pope's was dated and sent to the King, signifying, after the commendation of his piety, how far he had proceeded in this affair, out of a desire to bring some comfort to him and his kingdoms. But then he adds, in the former canting strain, "That the reason why he did not determine anything new at present, was the weightiness of the affair, and the example of the Pope's predecessors: for we, who are placed by God over the Christian world, in the chair of Christian wisdom, ought to hearken to the voice of the Holy Spirit, and not examine the matter by the poises of human reasons: wherefore, seeing the eternal Wis-

* P. 447.

† P. 450.

‡ P. 451.

dom has not yet discovered to the Church the recesses of so great a mystery, the faithful people ought to rest satisfied in the authority of God and the Roman Popes," &c.

The King sent his letters of thanks to the Pope,* dated July 14, 1622, and in like manner to the Cardinal Inquisitors, entreating them to use the same endeavours in what remained, till his Holiness would vouchsafe to define the controversy. And now all Spain sounded their gladness and erected their trophies, and nothing but expressions of joy were seen or heard for several months together.

But all this joy was interrupted at Barcelona,† Cæsar-Augusta, and other parts of the kingdom, by reason of a grant the Pope made, and which was publicly affixed, according to the clause of the foregoing constitution (excepting those to whom the Pope should give a special indulgence), wherein he gave this privilege to the Dominicans, notwithstanding the former decree, "that in any of their private conferences among themselves, and none else, they might freely and lawfully handle the matter of the blessed Virgin's conception, without incurring the penalties contained in the said decrees." Which was dated July 22, 1622. This grant, says the author of the history, troubled many who would have had the pious opinion secured and put beyond all doubt; but he hopes that those to whom the Pope gave this last indulgence will not abuse it, nor break out into open scandals, when the permission reaches no further than to private colloquies.

Thus we have seen the busy management of a four years' embassy ending just where it began, and made a pleasant piece of formal pageantry: great charity and piety pretended by two Kings, answered with deceit and pious frauds, apparently intended by two Popes. We have seen pretended infallibility sitting in a chair of state and saying nothing: a fierce controversy brought before an unerring judge, who will let nobody determine such matters without or besides himself; and when all earnestly expect how he will end it, he tires them with delays, or deceives them with doubtful answers. In a word, I verily believe that this judge of controversies has set a-foot ten for one he has ever decided: for though he calls this last his office, yet he is hardly brought to this work as a bear is to the stake; and when he is, he is either fearful of the consequences, and dares not speak out, or sullen and will not, or crafty and puts it

* P. 453.

† P. 455.

off, and says he cannot do it yet (as in the case before us, which I suppose he will leave for the day of judgment to decide); or if it happens that once in an age he gives us a cast of his office, as he hath done in this age in the case of Jansenius, the contending parties might have done as wisely to have referred the matter to a lottery, or the chance of a die, as bound themselves to stand to this blind award; for after his decision they find such manifest defects either of skill or honesty, that those who are condemned see no reason to retract or alter their opinion, and oftentimes are so bold as to declare and prove him to have been mistaken.

But though the Popes are resolved not to define the opinion of the Immaculists to be *de fide*, yet it is a great comfort to them that the Church has shewed a greater propension and inclination to this than the contrary. The Fathers of the Council of Basil* spake all their mind when they determined plainly for it: "That she was free from all sin original and actual, and declared that this opinion ought to be approved, held, and embraced of all Catholics, as pious and agreeable to the Church's worship, to the Catholic faith, right reason, and the holy Scripture; and that it shall be lawful for none to preach and teach the contrary." What an unlucky chance was it, that this decree was not anticipated three sessions, for then their work might have been effectually done! Whereas having in the thirty-fourth session deposed the lawful Pope Eugenius IV. the Council when it held this session which decreed the immaculate conception was itself schismatical, and so it became invalid, not having the Pope's confirmation herein. It is a great comfort to them, "That though," as a Jesuit† says, "our mother the Church of Rome is dumb (he means the Pope especially, who is the Church's mouth) in this question, yet, with Zachary, she sometimes takes the writing-tables into her hands, and does even as good (*tantum non*) as subscribe to the opinion of divines that contend for it." Even those dumb Popes have made very broad signs of their goodwill towards it. Witness their approbation of the feast of the conception, which, if it had not been without sin, we are told‡ had not deserved to be celebrated, being not worthy of veneration for itself, yea, hated by Job and Jeremiah because of the original

* Sess. 36.

† Jo. Bonifac. de vit. et mirac. Mar. Virg. l. 1. c. 4.

‡ Raynaudus Diptyc. Mar. p. 135.

stain annexed to it. Bernardinus de Busto composed an office of the conception, which the Pope approved, and gave indulgences to those that celebrated that office, as he himself tells us,* and cites several passages out of it.† Pope Sixtus IV. (as appears by his extravagant *cum præerelsa*) commanded and approved another office of the immaculate conception, composed by Leonard de Nogarolis, to be seen in the old Roman Breviary; and though Pius V. ordered this office to be the same with that of the nativity, yet even there in the eighth responsorio‡ it is said, "Let all perceive thy help who celebrate thy holy conception." There was also a religious order erected by St. Beatrix in Spain, under the title of the Immaculate Conception, and approved by Innocent VIII. And in the time of Pope Alexander VI. many fraternities§ were instituted, and temples erected in honour of the immaculate conception, especially in Portugal and Catalonia. Also a rule of nuns|| under the same title, approved by Julius II., in divers chapters of which rule the immaculate conception is asserted, as cap. 2, where a form of profession is proposed, and said that it is made for the love of God, and in honour of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin. And cap. 3. a garment (*pallium*) of a blue colour is decreed to be used, to signify that the soul of the Virgin, from her first creation, was altogether holy and celestial. This Pope also granted great indulgences,¶ as Leo X. did the like after him, to persons of both sexes, that in devotion carried the image of the conception on their breast. Temples and altars are erected to the memory of the same; and Pope Julius II., Pope Adrian VI., Pope Gregory XIII., and other Popes, have granted plenary indulgences in favour of the immaculate conception; and Pius V.** when he reformed the breviary, and took away some feasts, yet required that of the conception to be kept by the whole Church, and moreover gave liberty to the Franciscans to recite the proper and old office of the conception. So that although they have not got of their Father what they have so long desired, yet he has done something for them, and they are very jocund upon it, and full of consolation, as the language of one of them proclaims it,†† who thus breaks out:

* Marial. ser. 3. p. 40.

† Ibid. p. 51.

‡ Raynaud. ibid. p. 136.

§ Wadding. Legatio de Concept. p. 219.

|| Raynaud. ibid. p. 154.

¶ Wadding. ibid. p. 220.

** Id. ibid. p. 222.

†† Sherlog. Anteloquium in Cantic. Sec. 2. p. 114.

"O blessed Virgin, I give immortal thanks to thy Son that the days are come in which none dare so much as mutter that thou wast conceived in original sin. Oh! how many friends of thine have cried to Heaven with groans unutterable to see that day, and could not see it; but thy poor servant has seen it, seen it indeed, and it has greatly gladdened him. But who has so steelly a breast that will not be softened" (none, doubtless, unless it be the hard-hearted Pope, who cannot relent), "when all the world conspires to assert the innocency of the Virgin's soul! for as to the integrity of her body, none of the orthodox ever doubted it."

If after all this stir about the immaculate conception any one be so curious as to ask in what manner we are to conceive the blessed Virgin's preservation from original sin to have been effected, they have answers ready.

The last named Jesuit* is of opinion, "That when God made the covenant with Adam, he made him the head of all mankind, and wrapt up their fates and wills in his, only with a particular exception of *one creature*, and that only in one case, *viz.* if his Son should require such a creature for his mother; for then it was not his intention that the will of *that creature*, in order to sinful actions or the loss of grace should be included in the will of Adam."

Others who, as Bernardine† says, speculate the matter more devoutly, think that the seed out of which the blessed Virgin was to be conceived, was virtually preserved by God in the loins of Adam from all infection, and transmitted through all generations to her without any stain, of which immaculate seed she was conceived most pure and immaculate; and, he says, this is touched upon by the Psalmist (Psalm lxxxix.) where God says (according to the vulgar Latin), "I have sworn to David my servant that I will prepare thy seed for ever, and build thy seat from generation to generation."

SECT. V.

Concerning the Feast of the Virgin Mary's Conception.

There is nothing remains to be considered under this head of the blessed Virgin's conception, save only the institution of the feast on December 8, in memory and honour of it. Bellar-

* Idem. in Cantic. c. 1. v. 8. p. 347.

† Marial. ser. 9. p. 105. See also Galatinus de Arcan. lib. 7. c. 3.

mine* confesses ingenuously, "That some of the feasts of the blessed Virgin are new, and of a late institution; for the feast of her nativity begun," says he, "in the time of St. Bernard, but was not publicly received by the whole Church till after the decree of Sixtus IV., in *extravaganti cum præexcelsa*, that is Anno 1476." Petrus de Natalibus† when he wrote (which was in the same age), says, that this feast was not kept "by a general institution of the Church, but by the special devotion of some persons."

It is a ridiculous story that is told us by Galatinus,‡ out of I know not what Martyrology of J. Damascene, that the blessed Virgin is said to be *πρὸ συλλέψεως ἀγνῆ*, "pure before her conception;" though Canisius§ is not ashamed to mention it after him. Baronius|| and Bozius¶ would give it the credit of some antiquity by a Greek oration of Leo VI. emperor (about the year 886) upon the solemnity of the Virgin's conception, extant in manuscript in the Sfortian Library. But J. Bapt. Thiers,** who has thoroughly examined this matter of festivals, can find no mention of it among the Greeks before the Constitution of the Emperor Eman. Comnenus, A. D. 1166. In some particular churches of the west it began to be observed a little earlier; and the forwardest we meet with in celebrating of it were in England, though upon very slight grounds, and such as give it no authority: for the institution of it there depended upon very questionable revelations, such as agree not well among themselves, and some of them so ridiculous as to spoil their own credit together with that which depends on them.

The story which is most generally received, as that which gave rise to this feast, is told us by Pet. de Natalibus†† concerning St. Anselm, whilst he was prior in Normandy, before he was Archbishop of Canterbury, "That he, sailing to the parts of Brittany, as he was returning, a great tempest put the ship in extremest danger; so that, despairing of safety, they betook themselves to the help of God and the blessed Virgin; and on the sudden one clothed in the habit of a bishop came towards the ship, walking upon the waters, and calling for Anselm, told him, that if he would escape the danger he must

* De Cultu Sanctor. l. 3. c. 16.

† Catalog. Sanctor. lib. 1. c. 41.

‡ De Arcan. l. 7. c. 5.

§ L. 1. de Deip. c. 7.

|| Ad Martyr. Rom. Dec. 8.

¶ De sign. Eccles. l. 9. c. 8.

** De Fest. dierum imminutione, c. 17, 18. p. 90, 96.

†† Catal. Sanctorum, ubi supra

promise him before God that he would yearly keep the feast of the blessed Virgin's conception, and persuade all he could to do the same, informing him that the day of her conception was the sixth of the ides of December, and that the office to be said on that day should be the same with the office of the nativity, only changing the name of nativity into conception. When Anselm inquired who he was that brought this message, he told him he was Nicholas the bishop, and that he was sent by the mother of God to reveal this to them and to deliver them. Anselm promised to do as he was commanded, and confirmed it with a vow ; upon which the tempest immediately ceasing, and a fair wind blowing, they came safe to shore. Thus the said feast was first begun to be kept in St. Anselm's monastery, and afterwards in the church of Canterbury, when he was preferred thither.*

That Anselm was the first that instituted this feast in England, is acknowledged by Simon Mepham,* who, in a provincial synod at London, A.D. 1328, made a constitution to observe it, treading in the steps of his predecessor, venerable Anselm, who, says he, superadded this feast to those of blessed Mary that were more ancient.

Jacobus de Voragine† mentions three other revelations requiring this feast to be observed. The first of which is the very same for substance with the former, only it is dated somewhat before it, and the names are different : for he makes it to be in the time of William the Conqueror, about the year 1070, and the person to whom the apparition was, when the tempest threatened shipwreck, to be one Helsinus (others call him Elpinus), the abbot of Ramsey ; the rest agrees with what was set down before.

The second revelation or apparition is this. "In the days of Charles (no body knows which), King of France, there was a clerk, a kinsman of his, a great lover of the blessed Virgin, and one who daily read her Hours devoutly, who, by the advice of his parents, consenting to marry with a fair and noble maid, and receiving the nuptial benediction from a priest, after mass was ended, he remembered that he had not read that day the

* Thiers loc. citat. p. 323.

† Lombard. Hist. c. 188, which the old Roman Missal shews was the current tradition (cited by Balinghem. Peruas. Mar. p. 27.) *Triforme prodigium edocens officium probat hoc solennium justum esse, Dum Abbas Naufragium, Sacerdos supplicium, Levita refugium vult adesse.* See his Notes upon it.

Lady's Hours ; wherefore making all go out of the Church, and sending his spouse home, he read the Lady's Hours hard by the altar ; and when he repeated that antiphona, Thou art fair and comely, O daughter of Jerusalem, suddenly the blessed Virgin appeared between two angels, with Christ in her arms, saying to him, If I be so fair and comely, wherefore is it that thou leavest me, and takest another spouse ? Am not I fairer than she is ? Hast thou seen any so fair ? He made answer, O my lady, thy brightness excells all the beauty of the world, thou art elevated above the choirs of angels, what wouldst thou have me to do ? She answered, If thou wilt forego thy carnal spouse for my love, thou shalt have me for thy spouse in the celestial kingdom ; and if thou wilt solemnly celebrate the feast of my conception yearly upon the sixth of the ides of December, and preach the celebration of it, thou shalt be crowned with me in the kingdom of my Son ; after which words, the blessed mother of Christ vanished. The clerk refusing to return home, became a monk in another country, and after a short space of time, he was made the patriarch of Aquilegia, and carefully celebrated the feast of her conception, and ordained it to be kept yearly."

The third revelation is a scandalous story of a priest, "a devout worshipper of the Virgin, that used to sing her Hours, who, after he had been committing adultery with another man's wife, entered into a vessel to pass over the river Seine, and as he sailed sung the Virgin's Hours, and when he came to these words, *Ave Maria, gratia plena*, being in the midst of the river, a company of devils overturned the vessel and drowned him, carrying his soul to torments. On the third day the blessed Virgin, with a company of saints, came to the place where the devils tormented him, and said to them, 'Why do you so unjustly punish the soul of my servant?' They answered, 'We ought to have him, for he was taken doing our work.' The Virgin replied, 'If they ought to have him whose work he was employed in, then he is mine ; for when you drowned him, he was saying my matins, so that you are guilty of injustice to me.' When she had said this, the devils fled away, and she restored his soul to his body, and taking him by the arm, commanded the waters to stand as a wall on the right hand and left, and so brought him from the bottom safe to his harbour : who falling down at her feet, and asking her what return he should make for her kindness ? she desired him

for the future to have a care of committing adultery, and both to keep himself, and exhort others to keep the feast of her conception upon the eighth of December. Upon the saying which, he saw her ascend into heaven, and he led ever after a hermit's life, telling what had befel him, and doing as he was commanded."

We are also told,* out of the acts of St. Oringa (alias Christiana), who died in Etruria, A.D. 1310, how this feast was celebrated in heaven, being made known to her by a revelation: for she was wrapt up in an ecstasy into heaven, and saw the blessed Virgin sitting on a bright throne by her Son, clothed in a most precious garment, with all the saints rejoicing about her, and keeping a solemn feast. Oringa, admiring the cause of all this, and the whiteness of the garment wherein the mother of God shone, Christ himself gave her an account of it, that on that day they kept in heaven the feast of her immaculate conception, who, remaining a virgin, conceived and bore him who is the true God and man, and that the whiteness of her garment denoted the prerogative of her singular innocency.

Now what slender credit is to be given to these stories of apparitions and revelations St. Bernard will tell us, who, it seems, himself had met with them, and treats them very coarsely in his epistle to the canons of Lyons.† "They produce a writing of heavenly revelation, as they call it: as if any one might not in like manner produce a writing, in which the Virgin seemed to command the same thing (*sc.* observing a feast) for her parents, according to God's command, saying, Honour thy father and thy mother." (Little did he imagine that Joachim and Anne should have had a festival appointed for them, when he wrote this, which was not then thought of.) "I am not apt to be moved by such writings, which are neither backed with reason, nor favoured by certain authority." And it is very observable that the credit of this feast decayed in a little time, even here in England, where it was first observed: for in a Council held by Stephen Langton, archbishop, at Oxford, A.D. 1222, it was ordered,‡ "that all the feasts of blessed Mary should be kept, except the feast of the conception, for the celebrating of which no necessity is imposed." In this Council it is left at liberty; and in another Synod, a

* Raynaudus, ubi supra, p. 135

† Epist. 174.

‡ Concil. Labbe, tom. 11. part. 1. p. 274.

while after, at Worcester, A.D. 1240, under Walter de Cantilupo, the bishop there, where the feasts of his diocese are mentioned, this is left out,* and the same Synod, reckoning the feasts of the Church of Salisbury, does also again omit this.

The earliest time in any other Church, is the observation of it in France, A.D. 1215, in a decree of Galo and Simeon, legates of Pope Innocent III. related by Bochellus,† in these words: "This day the conception of the blessed Mary is celebrated by the command of the Apostolic chair." Which as Thiers observes,‡ argues that it was not observed in France before that Synod, for then it would have only been recited as other feasts there are, without adjoining this special admonition.

But all this reaches only to some particular churches, not to the universal observation of it; for it was opposed as an innovation by many and great men. St. Bernard is very sharp against it (in the forecited epistle to the canons of Lyons): "We wonder," says he, "what some of you mean, to bring in a new solemnity, which the custom of the Church is ignorant of: which reason does not prove, nor ancient tradition commend. What are we more learned or devout than the Fathers? We dangerously presume whatsoever in such things their prudence did pass by. And if so, what reason for the feast of the conception? How, I say, can her conception be asserted to be holy, which was not of the Holy Ghost, not to say that it is of sin; and can it have a festival when it is not holy? The glorious Virgin will willingly be without this honour, where either sin is honoured, or sanctity seems to be falsely brought in. This presumed novelty will no ways please her against the custom of the Church; it is the mother of temerity, the sister of superstition, the daughter of levity," &c. Petrus Cellensis§ defends this censure of St. Bernard against Nicholas a monk of St. Alban, who had objected to him that St. Bernard had recanted what he had written concerning the blessed Virgin's conception, in a vision to one of his college of Clervaux (which I before recited), when he appeared with a black spot upon his breast, arrayed in snow-white garments. To whom Pet. Cellensis answers: "I believe the Gospel, not dreams, concerning the blessed Virgin, and if I be otherwise

* Thiers, *ibid.* c. 20. p. 105.

† *Ibid.* 4. decret. Eccl. Gallic. tit. 9. c. 13.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 323.

§ *Ibid.* 9. Epist. 10.

mind than I ought, God will reveal this also when and how he pleases: in the mean time, while the voice is above the firmament, and does not descend so low as to us, I beg that the darkness of our ignorance may be enlightened, not by thee, but by the Father of lights."

The same is the opinion of Jo. Belet, * a Paris divine, who says, "Some have at some times celebrated the feast of the conception, and perhaps yet observe it; but it is not authentic nor approved, but rather seems to deserve to be prohibited, for she was conceived in sin."

With whom agrees also Durandus Mimatensis, † who shewing that only four feasts of the Virgin were observed by the Church, adds: "Some indeed make a fifth feast, viz. of the conception of the blessed Mary, saying, that as we celebrate the death of the saints, not because of their death, but because they are eternally happy; so in like manner the feast of the conception may be kept, not because she was conceived, or conceived in sin, but because she was conceived the mother of our Lord, affirming that this was revealed to a certain abbot in danger of shipwreck, which story is not authentic: so that this feast is not to be approved, seeing she was conceived in sin, to wit, by the commixture of male and female."

Thus I have largely considered the matters that relate to the blessed Virgin's Conception; and upon the whole may well conclude and say, from that Church where her conception without sin passes for a pious opinion; and which suffers this petition to be put up in her litanies, ‡ *Per immaculatam conceptionem tuam, libera nos mediatrix nostra*: O our Mediatrix, deliver us by thy immaculate conception," Good Lord deliver us! §

* De divin. Offic. c. 146.

† Rational. divin. Offic. l. 7. cap. 7.

‡ S. Litanie variae, Colonie, 643. p. 63.

§ [For recent evidences of Mariolatry see the Glories of Mary, by Liguori, canonized in 1839.—Mariolatry, by the Rev. Thos. Hartwell Horne.—Tributo Quotidiano Roma, 1844. being Psalms from the Psalter of Bonaventure.—L'Annuaire de Marie, par M. Menghi, D'Arville, Brussels, 1841.—The Sacred Heart, &c. See also the tracts and publications of the Reformation Society.]

